

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association.
For the present the QUARTERLY will be published in two DOUBLE numbers in April and October;
the times of publication of the REVIEW are variable under war conditions.

The Classical Review

Editors { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge
C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2

ALL COMMUNICATIONS intended for the Editors should be sent to MR. FORDYCE. BOOKS for review should be sent to the Publisher

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

PROF. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., F.B.A. (Chairman), representing the Cambridge Philological Society
J. G. BARRINGTON-WARD, M.A. (Hon. Treas.), PROF. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., PROF. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A., F.S.A., F. H. SANDBACH, M.A. (Hon. Sec.), } Representing the Council of the
PROF. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A. } Classical Association
E. A. BARBER, M.A., F.B.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society

With the co-operation of
PROF. J. L. MICHIE, University of Queensland, PROF. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, and PROF. B. D. MERITT,
Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

Volume LVI

NOVEMBER 1942

Number 3

CONTENTS

NOTES AND NEWS	97
RHYTHM, METRE, AND BLACK MAGIC. H. D. F. KITTO	99
THEOCRITUS, <i>ID.</i> ii. 59-62. A. S. F. GOW	109
STATIUS, <i>SILVAE</i> , 2. 1. 130. W. R. SMYTH	112
AN ANCIENT ARMOURED FORCE. R. M. RATTENBURY	113
ἌΡΒΗΛΟΣ. J. D. BEAZLEY	116
KINEIN TON 'ΑΦ' ΙΕΡΑΣ. F. H. COLSON	116
CICERO, <i>PRO SESTIO</i> , 72. O. SKUTSCH	116
TACITUS, <i>ANNALS</i> , xiv. 36. 1. L. J. D. RICHARDSON	117
STATIUS, <i>ACHILLEIS</i> , ii. 142. D. S. ROBERTSON	117
REVIEWS:	
<i>The Republic of Plato</i> (Cottingham), J. TATE	117
<i>Plato's Earlier Dialectic</i> (Robinson), N. R. MURPHY	119
<i>Philodemus, On Methods of Inference</i> (DeLacy), C. BAILEY	120
<i>L'évolution des constructions participiales complexes en grec et en latin; L'évolution des subordonnées relatives complexes en grec</i> (Mugler), W. L. LORIMER	122
<i>Philip V of Macedon</i> (Walbank), A. H. McDONALD	123
<i>The Roman Imperial Navy</i> (Starr), W. W. TARN	125
<i>The Challenge of the Greek</i> (Glover), H. J. ROSE	126
SHORT REVIEW	127
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	127
BOOKS RECEIVED	128

OXFORD : AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
LONDON, NEW YORK, TORONTO, AND MELBOURNE : HUMPHREY MILFORD

Price 3s. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$2.55. Combined yearly subscription for the
CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$5.32

Entered as Second Class at the New York, U.S.A., Post Office

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3. 15s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 10s., *Quarterly* 13s.; combined subscription £1. 1s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Miss E. C. Gedge, Westfield College, London, N.W. 3. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Mr. J. J. R. Bridge, Mutcombe, Fairfield Road, Bath, and Miss N. C. Jolliffe, Girton College, Cambridge) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz., Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, East Anglia, Cardiff, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

a
n
;
l
s
1
n
i
l
e
,

T

A J
the
Stud
Clas
was
5 Se
ly e
of e
stud
tion
plan
ings
exte
auth
mos
She
ture
Sch
The
Coll
Lib
stud
in 1
print
of C
of C
exh
the
wor
Ash

I
was
sen
Ag
Aff
me
Gen
rea
Civ
due
Pro
the
to
Ric
pro
con
wa
me
wo

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

NOVEMBER 1942

NOTES AND NEWS

A JOINT Meeting of the Societies for the Promotion of Hellenic and Roman Studies, to which members of the Classical Association also were invited, was held at Oxford from 29 August to 5 September. The organizers had hardly expected in war-time an attendance of even a hundred friends of classical studies, but nearly five hundred applications were received and the original plan of a meeting confined to the buildings of St. Hilda's College had to be extended. By the kindness of the authorities of the University of Oxford, most of the meetings were held in the Sheldonian Theatre, while lantern lectures were given in the Geography School and the University Museum. There were informal tea-parties at New College and Wadham. The Bodleian Library arranged an exhibition on the study of the classics and ancient history in England. Classical MSS. and early printed texts were on view in the library of Corpus Christi College. An exhibition of coins and the Warburg Institute's exhibition of photographs illustrating the influence of the Mediterranean world on Britain were visited at the Ashmolean Museum.

His Excellency the Greek Minister was unfortunately not able to be present. His place was taken by Dr. Th. Aghnides, Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs in the Royal Hellenic Government and former Under-Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who read a paper on 'The Greek Spirit as a Civilizing Influence'. He was introduced with an address of welcome by Professor Gilbert Murray, President of the Joint Meeting. The vote of thanks to Dr. Aghnides was moved by Sir Richard Livingstone. Sir Richard also proposed, and Professor Murray seconded, the following resolution, which was carried unanimously: 'The joint meeting of some four hundred men and women interested in ancient literature

and civilization, organized by the Societies for the Promotion of Hellenic and Roman Studies, and supported by the Classical Association, desires to emphasize the vital importance of providing in any plan for education after the war adequate facilities for these studies, upon which, as the centre of the humanistic tradition, European civilization has hitherto rested, and which, in the opinion of this meeting, cannot be neglected without grave consequences.' The resolution has been sent to the President of the Board of Education.

On other occasions the President of the Hellenic Society (Dr. A. W. Pickard-Cambridge), the President of the Roman Society (Dr. H. I. Bell), and Professor N. H. Baynes spoke of the importance of preserving the humanities in the post-war world and of the part which could be played in this task by the three societies represented at the meeting. It is to be hoped that one result of the Joint Meeting will be an increase in their membership.

An admirably varied programme included addresses by Professor H. M. Last on 'The Study of Ancient History: an Apology'; Professor F. E. Adcock on 'The Greek and Roman Art of War'; the Rev. M. P. Charlesworth on 'Pietas et Victoria, or the Emperor and the Citizen'; Professor N. H. Baynes on 'The Decline of the Roman Empire in Western Europe'; and Professor Gilbert Murray on 'Ritual Elements in the New Comedy'. Lantern lectures were given by the Rev. Gervase Mathew on 'The Third-century Transition in Thought and Art'; Miss G. R. Levy on 'The Greek Discovery of Perspective; its Influence on Renaissance and Modern Art'; Mrs. M. I. Henderson on 'Roman Imperialism in Lusitania'; Mr. I. A. Richmond on 'Recent Discoveries from the Air and in the Field and their Bearing on the History of Roman Britain'; Professor

J. D. Beazley on 'Potter and Painter in Ancient Athens'; and Miss J. M. C. Toynbee on 'Sidelights from Roman Medallions on the Study of Art and Antiquities in the Roman Empire'. Vocal illustrations accompanied a lecture by Dr. Egon Wellesz, entitled 'An Introduction to Byzantine Music'. Short papers were read by Professor J. L. Myres on 'The Order of Letters in the Greek Alphabet'; Dr. A. Momigliano on 'The Crisis in the Roman State from Sallust to Tacitus'; Dr. H. I. Bell on 'The Pronunciation of Latin: Evidence from the Papyri'; Dr. C. M. Bowra on 'The Blinding of Oedipus'; Professor E. D. M. Fraenkel on 'Aeschylus: New Texts and Old Problems'; Dr. F. Pringsheim on 'The Unique Character of Roman Law'; and Mr. L. J. D. Richardson on 'The Meaning of *ὑπηρέτης*: an unexplained nautical metaphor'. In the absence, through illness, of Professor F. M. Cornford, his paper 'Was Ionian Philosophy Scientific?' was read by Professor Gilbert Murray. A discussion on 'The Lack of Originality in the Roman Achievement' was opened by Mr. A. N. Sherwin-White, deputizing for Professor Arnold Toynbee, and Professor N. H. Baynes. Professors H. T. Wade-Gery and T. B. L. Webster opened a discussion on 'Sophocles: an Opposition Figure in Fifth-century Athens'. Mr. C. E. Stevens, with Mr. J. N. L. Myres in the chair, opened a discussion on 'Future Work in Romano-British Exploration', which led to a number of practical suggestions for post-war developments in Romano-British archaeology.

Amongst those who acted as chairmen for the lecturers were the President of the Classical Association (Dr. J. T. Sheppard), Major-General Sir Ernest Swinton, Professor D. S. Robertson, Professor F. de Zulueta, Dr. Edwyn Bevan, Dr. J. G. Milne, Mr. A. W. Gomme, Dr. T. H. W. Armstrong, and Miss M. V. Taylor.

The members of the Hellenic and Roman Societies and the Classical Association and their many friends who attended the Joint Meeting, the first of its kind to be held, feel a deep debt of

gratitude to the Hon. Secretaries, Miss G. R. Levy and Miss M. V. Taylor, for their excellent organization. This common assembly of lovers of the classics has sent many back to their war-time tasks refreshed and fortified with renewed faith in the value of the studies which it is the aim of the two Societies to promote. It is to be hoped that it will soon be repeated.

Comparative Literature Studies, founded in 1940, and published in Cardiff at the Priory Press, has reached its Vols. VI-VII with a slim issue of fifty-two pages, containing three articles of special interest to students of Greek and Latin.

Professor A. Lytton Sells concludes his study of Andromache as treated by Euripides and Racine, and summarizes Verrall's famous solution, which he regards as probable, of the mystery of the older play.

In 'The Fourth Concord' Mr. L. J. D. Richardson adds to the concords of gender, number, and case the further rule that 'an adjective agrees, normally, with its noun in *fact*', and proceeds to consider exceptions due to irony, as in 'bone custos' (for which, by the way, our equivalent is not 'You're a *nice* guardian' but 'You're a nice guardian'); to fixed epithets, as when a 'swift' ship rides at anchor; and so on. He ends with a discussion of

simplici myrto nihil adlabores
sedulus curo,

and argues that the last two words are to be taken as both negated together.

Under the title 'Synaesthetic Metaphor' Professor W. B. Stanford collects such flights of fancy as 'orange music' and 'light braying like an ass'. Of Greek instances he quotes Homer's application of *δεδήνειν*, *ἀμφιδέδην*, *δέδην* to sounds, and from Aeschylus the smell which is *ἀφεγγήσ* and that which *προσγελᾷ*. He mentions also *ὄπα λειριόεσσαν*, the sound of cicadas, to which Homer compares the voices of old men, right good orators. The phrase has a long history in Greek; but it has been doubted whether that adjective has anything to do with lilies at all.

And pat comes a letter from Mr. C. H.

Kae
word
with
the
inch
the
wh
the
extr
cica
Min

GRE
redu
desp
fit a
defe
metr
Fore
to th
it sh
artil
why
if ev
it; a
incl
whic
of b
nons
The
has

Th
The
our
ther
diffic
puts
short
1062

This
the
mia
Eur
were
exam
mia
red

It

1
1941.

Kaeppe, of Sydney, suggesting that the word has to do with lilies after all, but with their sound, especially with that of the *Ornithogalum thyrsoides* or chincherinchee. 'When these plants are growing, the stems are very close together, and when these rub against one another in the wind they produce a shrill sound extraordinarily like the note of the cicada'. 'Chincherinchees grow in Asia Minor. It seems that the use of the

adjective *λειρίστεις* is simply another instance of the Greeks' close observation of nature.'

It would be interesting to learn whether in Greece or near the western coast of Asia Minor the chincherinchee, or any other lily, produces a sound more notable than that of other plants which rustle, and fitter for comparison with melodious utterance of men.

RHYTHM, METRE, AND BLACK MAGIC¹

GREEK lyric metres are a subject which reduces many a classical scholar to despair; one in which he sees little profit and no certainty, its approaches defended by a veritable battery of metrical apparatus, and by a kind of Foreign Legion of music-symbols. As to the former, he wonders gloomily why it should be necessary to master all that artillery before he can read Pindar, and why he cannot read Pindar any better—if even as well—when he has mastered it; and as for the music-symbols, he is inclined to resent them as interlopers, which they are not, or to suspect them of being only another way of talking nonsense, which very often they are. The whole thing, as a Regius Professor has said, is like Black Magic.

There is no magic, black or white. There are serious deficiencies, both in our knowledge and in our evidence, and there are undoubtedly difficulties. It is difficult, for example, when a lyric poet puts together twenty-two consecutive short syllables, as Euripides does (H.F. 1062):

Ὥπνον Ὥπνον ὀλόμενον ὁς ἔκανεν ἀλοχον
ἔκανε δὲ τέκεα.

This difficulty is hardly diminished by the news that the metre is three dochmias resolved, for we wonder how Euripides' audience knew that they were three dochmias; did the poet, for example, whenever he resolved dochmias, send a man in front to wave a red flag?

It seems possible to discuss in general

terms some of these difficulties; also certain misconceptions in current metrical theories, misconceptions which make Greek lyric metres appear much more arbitrary and unintelligible than they are. This paper will make no attempt to be constructive; it attempts only a general discussion of some general points, of which the first is the difference between verse that is spoken or recited and verse that is sung.

If a person appeared before an audience as a reciter of verse, and said in declamatory style 'John --- John --- John ---', the audience would be at a loss, experiencing not only a certain deficiency in the sense of this performance, but also a total absence of rhythmical or metrical structure. But the nursery-game 'John Brown's body lies a-mouldering in the grave' is familiar. First the verse is sung complete: next time the players omit the last syllable and nod instead; next time they omit the last two and nod twice; finally, they do nothing but nod. The penultimate stage would be 'John --- John --- John ---', and the point is that in the game, though the sense is by now attenuated, there is no lack of rhythmical or metrical structure. The rhythm is kept going, inwardly by the imagined tune, and outwardly by the nodding heads. Nodding in this way would be, in Greek terminology, a form of dancing; and the essence of the Greek choral lyric is that it was, like this verse, combined with dancing.

Here we have an extreme illustration of a simple but most important difference. In plain verse, verse which was

¹ Read to the Classical Association on 22 April 1941.

merely spoken—or indeed chanted in the Homeric manner—the metrical structure, that regular pattern which distinguishes verse from prose, can be indicated only in the speaking, only in the measured way in which the syllables fall from the speaker's lips. Obviously: for there is nothing else, no other rhythmical medium—no tune, no rhythmical gesticulation. This is true, presumably, even of the epic chant; the wavy harp-accompaniment which supported the voice did nothing to fix its rhythm, but rather followed it. The metrical pattern can exist only in the words: if they stop, the pattern stops too. Without the 'dance' that 'John - - - John - - - John - - -' was nothing.

But the words of the choral lyric were not spoken at all; they were sung, and they were accompanied by the dance. This is a misleading way of expressing the facts; one might as well say that the dance was accompanied by the words, for the choral lyric was the late flowering of the original Greek poetic art, that *μονοική* for which we have in English no name, a union of poetry, dancing, and music. Biologically speaking, epic is a later form; it has, for the special purpose of presenting narrative, got rid of the dance, reduced the music to an indefinite chant supported by the harp, and simplified the metre. But in the choral lyric all three are very much alive, so that the basic pattern, the metre, was exhibited as it were on three levels at once: in the actual metre of the words, in the music, and in the dance. Of course these three rhythms were one and the same thing. We must forget the modern song, in which, too often, the composer's musical setting seizes and man-handles the poet's verse, forcing it into another rhythmical pattern. In the Greek lyric, poetry and dance and tune were conceived together; the same man was poet, composer, choreographer; and the separate rhythms of the poetry, the dance, and the music were only different aspects of the same thing.

But they were different aspects, and this distinction is not merely a theoreti-

cal one. All the distinctive features of lyric metres become intelligible at once when we remember that it was no longer the sole responsibility of the poetry to present the rhythmical pattern, but that the dance and the music did the same.

For consider the resolution of syllables. In spoken iambic trimeters, when as many as three of the six longs are resolved we feel that resolution is reaching its limit; more resolution would imperil the clarity of the metrical structure. But in lyric trimeters whole verses are frequently resolved. They are difficult, even impossible, to read at sight: we have often to count the syllables to see if such a verse is iambic or trochaic catalectic. But what of that? They were not intended to be read. They were sung, and the basic iambic pattern was to be seen, as plain as a pikestaff, in the dance. The dance gave arsis—thesis, arsis—thesis, - - - - , and there could be no obscurity, even if every thesis was resolved into two shorts. So with those resolved dochmias; the pattern was perfectly clear in the dance. The metre of the text could afford to cut what we may respectfully call capers, because it was not responsible for making the pattern clear.

Theoretically, the words could leave off altogether; the rhythm would still go on, as in 'John Brown's Body'. There are reasons for supposing that this possibility was not much exploited; still, when we find, as we constantly do, a short syllable at the end of a verse doing duty for a complete dipody, we are not to think that the short is being uncomfortably dragged out to the length of six shorts; what happened is that the dipody was complete in the dance, but incomplete in the text.

The converse of resolution is prolongation: one syllable of the text corresponds to arsis and thesis in the dance (and to one or two notes of the melody indifferently). The one syllable is a complete foot in itself. This, in sung verse, is as natural as resolution, and both effects are brilliantly used by Sophocles (*Antig.* 586 ff.):

ὅμοιον ὥστε πόντιον
οἴδαμα, δυσπνόοις ὅταν
Θρήσσογον ἔρεφος ὑφαλον ἐπιδράμη πνοῖσι,
κυλίνεις βινσόθεν κελανά θίνα καὶ
δυσάνεμοι στόνῳ βρέμουσιν ἀντιπλῆγες ἀκταί.

The resolutions in the third verse are beautifully suggestive of the wind fretting the surface of the sea (with which compare the shimmering light in the antistrophe); and the swell that heaves up black ooze from the bottom is even more remarkably pictured in the heavy iambics of the following verse:

— — | — — | — — | — — | — — .¹

But it may be objected that it is most unnatural to read verse with such 'prolongations'. Of course it is—but the verse was not read: it was sung. To this point we shall return. Meanwhile, we may notice another difference between the two types of poetry, one which has to do with time-keeping or, what is the same thing, quantity.

In strict metric, the iambic dipody, — — —, is  or one two (three) four five (six); but who supposes that the Greek actor, in reciting his trimeters, kept to such a strict time, as if reciting to a metronome? It would be possible, but the effect would be ludicrous. Obviously the actor compromised between this strict time-scheme and the more elastic rhythms and quantities of ordinary speech. But if he did this, what about the venerable formula that a long equals two shorts? The answer is, of course, that this (in spoken verse) is not a mathematical statement but a working convention. Actual quantities are infinite in number, much as the tones used in speaking are indefinite in pitch. Spoken verse *must* approximate to the infinite range of the quantities used in ordinary speech, and amid these inexactitudes only two quantities can usefully be distinguished, the long and the short. (The 'irrational' is a purely musical conception, two in the time of three, incorrectly transferred to spoken verse.)

On the other hand, in sung verse it is

¹ Or, if the reader prefers it, — — (—) — | (—) — — | — — (—) — | (—) — — |. This rhythm too is just as effective (though no longer pictorial) in the antistrophe.

a mathematical statement that the long is twice as long as the short—unless indeed a given long is three, four, or five times as long as a short. This is so because in sung verse exact time-keeping is both natural and necessary; the dance demands it, even if not the tune too. No longer are we limited to that rough-and-ready classification into long and short; syllables or notes are now given an exact length. (But again with only restricted reference to the actual quantities of speech. In *ποῖ ποῖ στρέφω* the long syllable *ποιστρ* is, in speech, longer than the syllable *ποιπ*, but that would not prevent a lyric poet from treating the phrase as — — — | — — — |.) And now that time-keeping has become exact, it becomes possible to have longs of varying lengths—equal to two, three, four, or five shorts, as more than one ancient authority says.

As such prolongation has recently been denied by so accomplished a rhythmician as Professor G. Thomson,¹ it may not be amiss to illustrate the point further. Thomson denies that the rhythm of

ἐπεὶ δ' ἀνάγκας ἔδυ λέπαδον

is — — — (—) — — — (—) —, two of the longs having each the value of three shorts: '... a sensitive ear is shocked. The persistent distortion of the natural rhythm of the words, which makes their meaning not more but less intelligible, is in itself sufficient to condemn it.'

What is the natural rhythm of the word 'daisy'? Should we be far wrong in calling it a trochee? and 'daisy daisy' a trochaic dipody, — — — ? But if we sing that excellent tune 'Daisy Bell' we turn these words into something else; for the most rhythmical tune goes

Dai - sy, Dai - sy, give me your answer, do
— — | — | — | — — — | — — — | — |

Each syllable of each 'Daisy' is prolonged over three beats, so that 'Daisy Daisy' becomes not one dipody but two. Does this distort the natural rhythm? Of course it does; strict scansion of any kind does that. Does

¹ Denied, that is, for poets earlier than Euripides (*Oresteia*, ii. 335).

it make the sense less intelligible? That perhaps is a matter of opinion. Are the prolongations in any way unnatural? Obviously not, if they are sung. The mistake is to apply to sung verse restrictions that are valid only for spoken verse. It is not true—or not necessarily true—that in sung verse a long must be equal to two shorts; if if were, the rhythm of *κυλίνδει βυσσόθεν κελανὰν θῆνα καὶ* would have to become something like ~ | --- | --- | --- | ---, which may be metre, but is more like murder.

This difference between the two kinds of verse can be illustrated also from Tennyson's 'Break, break, break', in which the poet plays with effects that belong to the metric of music rather than of spoken verse. The prolongation of each 'Break' is as unnatural in spoken verse as it is natural in sung verse. Tennyson indeed calls the poem 'A Song'.

We note then these differences, that sung verse, in which the metrical pattern was presented on three levels, could indulge in resolutions, rests, and prolongations quite beyond the compass of spoken verse; and that these effects are the more natural that music and dancing bring with them a precision of time-keeping foreign to spoken verse. These are metrical differences. There are also rhythmical differences, which will be considered later. Let us first inquire if the ancient tradition recognized these metrical differences.

The ancient tradition ran in three definite channels; there were the Rhythmicci, and the Metrici, and *οἱ συμπλέκοντες*—optimists who tried to combine the other two.¹ So far as lyric metres are concerned, the difference between these schools was, roughly speaking, that the Rhythmicci talked sense, the Metrici nonsense, and *οἱ συμπλέκοντες* both.

The Metrici, in general, were grammarians who brought to metrical studies the conviction that a long equals

two shorts and nothing else, and a high-minded determination to take notice of nothing except the syllables of the text in front of them. These principles, naturally, worked well enough in that poetry of which they are true—hexameters, iambic trimeters, and the like; though they broke down already with the pentameter, which has that inconvenient prolongation or pause in the middle and at the end; and the name 'pentameter' commemorates the insufficiency of their principles, conveying as it does the remarkable belief that the verse consists of twice two-and-a-half dactyls.—Though even this is more intelligent than a later theory that the pentameter consists of two dactyls, one spondee (with a pause in its vitals), and two anapaests. Such is the necessary result of believing that a long must equal two shorts, and that only the syllables count.

The Metrici avoided lyric metres as much as they could; when they did not, disaster was never far away. One example must suffice. Hephaestion cites from Telesilla

ἀδ' Ἀρτέμις, ὁ κόραι,
φεύγουσα τὸν Ἀλφέον,

explaining the metre as an ionic *a maiore*, a trochee, and half a trochee. This is ludicrous enough; but in a later chapter he cites the verses again, and says this time that they are two anapaests and a half, the half-anapaest being the word *κόραι*; for Hephaestion thought (like Wilamowitz) that as a final syllable is 'common' a long can stand though metre demands a short. The principles of this tradition are clear and simple. You entirely disregarded the very elements of rhythm—as for example whether it was anapaestic, which rises, or ionic *a maiore*, which falls. You simply divided the syllables, as it occurred to you, into sections, and these you called 'feet'. Hence the monstrous brood of amphibrachs. Wilamowitz was not too severe when he said that the only thing of value in Hephaestion is the fragments he preserves.

Turning from this to the Rhythmicci, we find ourselves in a very different and

¹ See Aristides Quintilianus, p. 40 (Meibom): *οἱ μὲν οὖν συμπλέκοντες τὴν μετρικὴν θεωρίαν τὴν περὶ ῥυθμῶν τοιαύτην τινὰ πεποιηγμένην τὴν τεχνολογίαν.*

highly technical of the text and principles, in that hexameter is like; and with unconcern in the name of the in-
specting, at the half-line, more at the one, one and necessary must the
as not, One
tion
c a
nee.
inter
and
na-
est
ion
a
can
ort.
are
is-
—
na-
re,
he
to
'.
ni-
re
ts
i,
d

much more intelligent world, but one of which little remains; only a few fragments of Aristoxenus' treatise on *Rhythmic* (less difficult than his *Harmonics*), and stray pieces of his teaching preserved in later writers, of whom Aristides Quintilianus is the most useful. Here only a very few aspects of his theory can be considered. Our first inquiry is if Aristoxenus knew of the distinction between verse that was sung and verse that was spoken.

Many of the Metrii said, and still more seem to have believed, that rhythm was a certain disposition of syllables. (That is why they came to grief with metres which contained rests as well as syllables.) Aristoxenus knew better. He had the advantage that from the start he thought in terms of *μονοική*, the triple art; he did not, like the Metrii and ourselves, begin with a very attenuated form of it. Rhythm, says Aristoxenus, is a certain disposition of 'times', *χρόνοι*; the implication is that what happens within these 'times', whether sound or silence, is a secondary matter. His general conception is this. Ordinary continuous time is rhythmless—just as a continuous straight line may be called rhythmless. To be made susceptible of rhythm, time must be divided or articulated into definite lengths or intervals; *χρόνος* must be divided into *χρόνοι*, and rhythm is a proper disposition of these *χρόνοι*. And how is plain time divided? Not by syllables, as the text-bound grammarians thought, but by *τὰ τρία ρυθμοθησόμενα*, by those three elements of his art which the poet-composer wishes to make rhythmical, namely words, tune, and dance, *λέξις*, *μέλος*, *σωματική κίνησις*.

Aristoxenus then makes it quite clear that it is unnecessary for all these elements at once to mark off a *χρόνος*; thus the division may be made by the *μέλος* and the *σωματική κίνησις* but not by the *λέξις*—which implies, obviously, a prolongation. The *χρόνοι* (say, *—*) are articulated in the dance and melody, but not in the text. Aristoxenus' treatment of this important point is summary; he promises more *ἐν τοῖς ἔπειτα*,

which have been lost. Still, we have enough to justify the assertion that his theory recognized the implications of the three levels on which the choral lyric presented its rhythm. He saw that there was no particular sanctity in the syllable. The essential thing was the succession of perceptible *χρόνοι* or, as we should say, 'beats'; and so long as these were made clear, it did not matter *where* they were made clear, whether in all, or two, or only one of the *ρύθμοις θησόμενα*.

It seems then that our arguments based on the threefold presentation of rhythm in the choral lyric were anticipated by Aristoxenus; and that metrists ancient and modern are liable to create difficulties for themselves by attributing to the syllables alone a function which in fact they shared with the music and the dance.

So far we have been thinking metrically, that is on points which primarily concern *measurement*.¹ Let us now think rhythmically (that is, about flow and continuity); and that on two points in particular. The first point is this proposition: that there is no analogy between the lyric 'verse' and (say) the epic or dramatic 'verse'; that the lyrical analogue of the epic or dramatic 'verse' is the stanza; and that failure to see this has been an *ἀρχὴ κακῶν*.

It might be well to illustrate the difficulty first. Pindar begins *Ol.* iii, in his noble dactylo-epitrite metre,

Τυνδαρίδας τε φίλοξενοις ἀδειν καλιπποκάμῳ θ'
Ἐλένα
κλεινάν Ἀκράγαντα γεραίρων εὐχομαι,

which is explained by Masqueray² and others as (v. 1) three dactyls, second epitrite (i.e. trochee), three dactyls; (v. 2) three anapaests, third epitrite (i.e. iambus). The difficulty is the sudden and unexplained switch from the falling rhythm of the dactyls and trochees to the rising rhythm of the anapaests and iambus. That this distinction between rising and falling rhythms is no modern fad is proved (if

¹ The Headlam-Thomson theory, which makes no attempt to measure, is not a system of metric at all, strictly speaking, but a descriptive rhythmic.

² *Traité de métrique grecque*, p. 317.

proof is wanted) by Aristides Quintilianus, who points out¹ that rhythms which begin (like dactyls) with the thesis are *ἡσυχαίτεροι*, and that those that begin with the arsis are *μᾶλλον τετραγμένοι*. But if Pindar several times within a stanza jumps from one to the other without perceptible reason, what is the use of talking about the effects of rhythm, and where is that famous Greek sensitiveness? But it is not the poet, it is the metrician, who does the jumping.

Since the stanza was danced, its rhythm—that is the total rhythm of the whole threefold complex—must have been continuous, going on without a break from the beginning of the stanza to the end. I cannot prove this, except from the impossibility of supposing that the dance-movement was anything but one smooth progression containing no gaps or jerks. The dancers certainly did not dance line by line. There are of course breaks or gaps between the verses of the text; but any such pauses that can be detected in the text, 'rests' for the singers though not for the dancers,² were integral parts of that complete rhythm, of which the words are a not quite complete reflection. The total rhythm went on, steady and uninterrupted, through these breaks in the text.³ (The point is illustrated below.)

¹ P. 97 (Meibom).

² Who were of course in fact the same people.

³ I may perhaps mention here a point for which there was no time when this paper was read. It is this, that in favourable circumstances we can check, with certainty, the extent of these rests; e.g. the strophe of Pindar, *Ol.* I is analysed by Schroeder into three periods of 23, 23, and 22 theses respectively. Asked to admire the symmetry, I refuse: I can see only a deliberate eccentricity in these figures—but Pindar was not an eccentric. Obviously, what Pindar designed was not 23-23-22, which is artistic nonsense, but 24-24-24, which is sense. In the syllables of the text we have not got Pindar's complete rhythm: four 'bars' or 'theses' are missing; but it was only this *complete* rhythm that Pindar had any desire to make symmetrical. And, now that we know how much it is that we have to measure here, we find another control for our metric: for example, the last four verses of this stanza must obviously be not 6-5-6-5 but 6-6-6-6. A system of metric which makes this impossible is itself impossible.

Compare this with a passage of dramatic speech, either of stichomythia or of a *ρήσος*. The verses that compose a *ρήσος* may be knit together, as the stichomythia is not, by an overriding rhetorical rhythm, but we are not thinking of rhetorical rhythms. In either case, each iambic trimeter is an independent unit, a small rhythmical system of its own, with its two *cola*; an independent unit which is a *continuum*, containing no metrical (as distinct from rhetorical) gaps; a unit which can be repeated indefinitely; and after each verse there is a gap or interval of time, indefinite in length. This gap may in fact be long, as at a change of speakers, or reduced to vanishing-point, as when Sophocles ends a verse with *ὅτι* or *τό*; but, whatever its size, it exists, metrically, always; and it consists of non-metrical or extra-metrical time, part of neither verse. But between the verses of a stanza there can be no non-metrical time—for what would the dancers do with it? Stand with one leg in the air? In lyrical poetry the smallest rhythmical unit which is a *continuum*, which can be repeated indefinitely, which has a gap of non-metrical time after each repetition (but no metrical gap within itself)—this is the stanza. The analogue in lyric verse to the epic hexameter or the dramatic trimeter is not the verse but the stanza.

Masqueray's mistake is that he equates the lyric with the dramatic 'verse', and this is the effect. The dramatic verse, being a complete system, naturally occupies a certain number of complete feet: it neither begins nor ends in the middle of a foot. Its component *cola* do, but not the verse as a whole. Similarly, the lyric stanza, being a complete system, occupies a number of complete feet—usually, for (*αὐδάσομαι ἐνόρκιον λόγον ἀλαθεῖ νόμῳ*) it may begin with an anacrusis; but there is no reason, except inaccurate analogy, for supposing that the component verses of a stanza do this. The rhythm of the stanza is continuous, and the verses may begin or end in the middle of a foot like the two *cola* which compose the hexameter or the trimeter.

Let us once more invoke 'Daisy Bell':

Daisy, Daisy, give me your answer, do:
I'm half crazy, all for the love of you.
It won't be a stylish marriage . . .

The first two verses are trochaic, in falling rhythm; the third begins with an up-beat—switching, therefore, on Masqueray's system, to iambic and rising rhythm. But the rhythm doesn't change at all—we possess the tune and we *know*. The syllable 'it' belongs metrically to the last foot of the previous verse. The word 'do' represents six beats,¹ the word 'you' only five; the sixth is 'it':

L L	L L	U U U	L ⌈
L L	L L	U U U	L ⌈
U U U U	L ⌈ . . .		

So in Pindar: the first syllable of v. 2, *κλειν* —, is, metrically, the second half of the last dactyl of v. 1. Pindar's rhythm does not suddenly stand on its head; it continues to be dactylic and trochaic. There is an overlap of rhythmic figure and metrical structure, the second verse (like the second part of an hexameter or trimeter) beginning in the middle of a foot.

The justification for using 'Daisy Bell' to illustrate Pindar is that in both the rhythm is continuous; in neither does the stanza consist of independent verses separated by a vacuum. The points raised could be illustrated also from an English stanza-form which has a rhythm strong enough to be regarded as continuous.

There once was a man of St. John's
Who erected a statue in bronze
Which wasn't much use
Until it got loose
And fell upon one of the dongs.

The following consideration of the rhythm premises that the rhythm is made strict, as for example it would be if it were bawled out by an army on the march (thus becoming a 'dance'-rhythm). In the first place we notice that the lines may begin with one or with two unaccented syllables indifferently: the metre is not affected. We

shall see presently that one or two syllables can be added at the end of the long verses without affecting the metre. In the second place, we notice that although the words contain only thirteen strong accents, or thirteen feet, the army needs sixteen feet in which to accommodate the stanza. As with the *First Olympian*, the true rhythmic dimensions are noticeably ampler than the mere syllables. If, for convenience, we use the conventional equation of stress with quantity, we may present the stanza thus:¹

~ | - - - | - - - | U | ⌈ |
~ | - - - | - - - | U | ⌈ |
~ | - - - | - - - | - | ⌈ |
~ | - - - | - - - | - | ⌈ |
~ | - - - | - - - | U | ⌈ |

The first syllable of all is a genuine anacrusis—this being the only syllable that can be such. The other preliminary syllables belong, metrically, to the last foot of the preceding verse; a fact which explains why there may be either one or two of them, for if there are two instead of one, the 'rest' in which the previous verse ends is shorter by the length of one short syllable. If we write out the continuous rhythm continuously we see how the living rhythmic figures (the 'verses') variously overlap the fixed metrical milestones—just as a melodic phrase may overrun or stop short of a bar-line. (For simplicity I use the symbol ⌈ to indicate a rest equal to one, two, or three syllables indifferently.)

~ | - - - | - - - | - ⌈ | ⌈ | - - - |
- - - | - ⌈ | ⌈ | - - - | - ⌈ | - - - | - ⌈ |
~ | - - - | - - - | - ⌈ | ⌈ |

A metrical analysis which had to ascribe a different *metre* to v. 2 because of the extra syllable would be out of touch with the rhythmic facts.

¹ When this paper was read, some hecklers maintained that the rhythm is 'anapaestic', not 'dactylic'. The point is not essential to the present argument, which could be restated in anapaestic terms; but I think the second limerick quoted is strongly in favour of the 'dactylic' view.—I have been unable to discover the authors of these verses, and apologize if copyright has been infringed.

¹ How many of the six are sung and how many are 'rests' does not concern us.

It should not be said that the first two syllables of v. 2 are, by *correptio*, put into the time of one. The following ingenious verse, besides showing how the verse can be extended at the end without in the least affecting the overall amplitude of the stanza, shows that these double preliminary syllables are to be thought of as having the real value of two syllables:

A certain strong man on a Syndicate,
Arose his position to vindicate:
 He wished to deny
 That he meant to imply
What his words, as they stood, seemed to indicate.

Obviously the last three verses were designed as a *πινίος*, to be spoken with no intermediate rests. *Correptio*, by introducing two short rests, would spoil the rhythm.

'Daisy Bell', then, proves that in a stanza which is sung it would be a blunder to suppose that the successive rhythmical units which we call verses must begin with a new metrical unit; the rhythmical analysis of the limerick suggests the same. I see no possibility of denying that the rhythms of Pindar's stanzas were just as continuous, and that his verses behaved in exactly the same way. Certainly there is no advantage in denying it, when the result is to turn a smooth metre into an arbitrary assemblage of metrical units, among which we leap from dactyls to anapaests and from trochees to iambi. There is no real analogy between a 'verse' in Pindar and a 'verse' in Sophocles.

The second point in this rhythmical scrutiny concerns the quadrisyllabic theory, which scans the verse

Τυνδαρίδαις τε φιλοξένοις ἀδεῦν καλλιπλοκάμῳ θ'
Ἐλένᾳ

—a choriamb, an ionic *a minore*, a trochaic dipody, a choriamb, and an ionic *a minore* (with a final rest). It may be satisfying, but it is no argument, to say that this looks more like inorganic chemistry than metre; there may, however, be argument in bringing this into connexion with Aristoxenus. If we must be quadrisyllabists, we may as well know what we are doing.

These dipodies may look neat and tidy, and the principle on which they are built, *versilbigkeit*, may sound impressive; but they suffer from two great defects: they rarely give two consecutive feet in the same rhythm, and they can be found in Demosthenes nearly as easily as in Pindar.¹ The dipodies are indeed of the same size, but they have no other resemblance. Trochees and major ionics are in falling rhythm, iambi and minor ionics in rising; and that, as we have seen, is a difference to which the Greeks were not deaf. But these dipodies conflict with each other in an even more important respect.

With their two longs and two shorts they have the value of six shorts. Now the metronomists who have introduced this system to a distracted world do not seem to be aware that there are two ways of counting six; or, if they know this, they think it does not matter, and *that* one is reluctant to believe. We can count 1 2 3 4 5 6, or 1 2 3 4 5 6; two threes, or three twos: a chief accent and a subsidiary one, or a chief accent and two subsidiary ones. In the language of music-rudiments, six beats can be in duple or in triple time. This distinction between duple and triple² is obviously fundamental, the most fundamental thing in rhythm. For example, we can march to the one rhythm, but not to the other. We can march to 'Daisy', which is in duple time (two threes to the bar), but not to 'God Save the King', because 'God Save the King' is in triple time and we have not got three legs.

Now, surely it is reasonable to say this: if this dactylo-epitrite metre, which is, after all, the metre of half of Pindar's surviving poetry (and dance), entirely disregards those which seem to us to be the two most important points in rhythm, namely duple-triple and rising-falling, and is based in-

¹ Here, for example, is the opening of the *Midias*, and the scansion thereof (admittedly a hiatus has to be overlooked): τὴν μὲν ἀδελφευαν, ὃ ἄνδρες δικασταί, καὶ τὴν ὑβριν, ἣ πρὸς ἄπαντας δει χρήγαι Μειδίας . . . : - u - - u - (or - u -)

² To simplify the argument I say nothing of quintuple. Four-time of course is duple.

and they im-
reat
ecu-
they
early
dies
hey
nees
hm,
and
e to
But
her
orts
ow
ed
do
wo
ow
nd
can
wo
nd
of
in
on
ly
cal
an
to
'
to
the
g'
ot
y
e,
of
)
m
at
le
n
e
a
e
)

stead on what seems to us a merely arithmetical conception of dipodies equal in size,¹ then the Greek sense of rhythm was so different from our own that we cannot possibly appreciate it, only analyse it in a purely intellectual way. And if this is true, we may hope to find some indication of it in Aristoxenus.

When Aristoxenus turns from his general theory of rhythm to the discussion of the different types of rhythm, he begins by classifying them in a way which has bewildered more than one metrician; for the familiar anapaest is called dactylic, the trochee iambic; worse still, the single iambus, $\sim -$, is iambic, but the iambic dipody is dactylic. It sounds like a metrician's nightmare, but it is all perfectly good sense.

Of course Aristoxenus knew the difference between an anapaest and a dactyl, but he knew also that between feet there is a distinction more fundamental than the order of syllables: arsis-thesis, or thesis-arsis. He deals first with this more fundamental distinction, which is precisely the distinction that we make fundamental, namely this matter of rhythm, duple or triple (or quintuple).

In every foot (except those of quintuple rhythm) the thesis is either equal to the arsis or twice as long. In the anapaest, dactyl, and spondee, thesis and arsis are equal: in the single trochee and iambus and in the ionics the thesis is twice as long. The 1:1 ratio Aristoxenus calls the *δακτυλικόν γένος*, the 2:1 the *ιαμβικόν γένος*. This is exactly our distinction between duple and triple time, but expressed (as always) in terms of the dance, not of music.

Now let us consider the trochaic dipody. In one sense it has two theses (the two longs), but obviously the accent on one of these is superior to the accent on the other. (This is obvious, because if the accents were equal we should have not a dipody but two single

feet.)¹ That is to say, the second long stands to the first as arsis does to thesis: or, to be more accurate, the second $\sim -$ is the arsis to the first $\sim -$, which is the thesis of the dipody. There are, as Aristoxenus says, two equal beats in the dipody, one down, and one up, each beat corresponding to the syllables $\sim -$ or $\sim \sim -$ or $\sim \sim$. So there are too in the dactyl, each corresponding there to $\sim -$ or $\sim \sim$. Also in the anapaest. All these therefore are in duple time, and we can march to them—to 'Daisy', which is in six-time, as easily as to 'Rule Britannia', which is in four-time; not, however, to the National Anthem, which is in three-time. This is the reason why Aristoxenus assigns the single trochee to the *ιαμβικόν γένος*, 2:1, but the double trochee to the *δακτυλικόν γένος*, 1:1. He is recognizing first the major fact that the dipody and the (metrical) dactyl are in the same rhythm. The differences between them can wait.

But with the ionics, the major fact is that they are in triple time. They have nothing in common with anapaests, dactyls, or the iambic or trochaic dipodies. (They would, of course, with a genuine dactylic tripody: 1 2 3 4, 5 6 7 8, 9 10 11 12, $\sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim$, a light rhythm in a fast tempo.) They belong to the *ιαμβικόν γένος*. It is perfectly true that the ionics, like the dipodies, contain four syllables, but it never occurs to Aristoxenus to mention the fact: it has nothing to do with metre or rhythm. Six beats in duple time and six beats in triple time are totally different things.

Such is Aristoxenus' approach to rhythm. I have spent so much time on it because it seemed important to show

¹ Greek theory recognized, what the modern musician knows, that the size of the rhythmical unit, whether monopody, dipody, tetrapody (cf. 2:4 time), is very much a matter of *άρχη*, tempo. *Frag. Paris.* § 12 διαφέρονται δὲ οἱ μείζονες πόδες τῶν διαρρόων ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ γένει ἀρχῆ. To give an illustration: both the National Anthem and 'Daisy Bell' are in some sort of three-time (trochaic); but the time of the Anthem goes slowly, and the accent on the first, fourth, seventh . . . beats is equal; but 'Daisy' goes more quickly, and the accent on 1 and 7 is stronger than that on 4 and 10. That is, the Anthem goes *κατὰ μονοποδίαν*, 1 2 3 1 2 3, 'Daisy' *κατὰ διποδίαν*, 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6.

¹ This equality in dipodies has no relation to our equality between bars. Our equal bars reflect our equidistant stresses: the equal dipodies do not produce equidistant stresses (or arses), nor anything like it.

that he regarded as fundamental what we regard as fundamental. If we could go further into his treatment of rhythm, we should nowhere find dark sayings pointing to a sense of rhythm foreign to our own; on the contrary, he raises the same questions that we raise, and gives (in his dance-controlled terminology) the answers that we give. He explains clearly such points as the difference between $\frac{9}{8}$ and $\frac{12}{8}$; he even recognizes¹ the fact that a conductor has a left hand as well as a right. Never is there a hint at anything remote from our own rhythmical experience; from which surely we may conclude that, if a metrical system is remote from our experience and gives results which seem arbitrary, it is probably wrong.

The black magic, the chaos, comes from the Metrii. Aristoxenus took great trouble to explain that the first great difference between feet was their rhythm or time; Hephaestion was not interested. To him it was all one whether Telesilla's fragment, for example, was in ionic (triple time), ana-paestic (duple time), or both at once. It did not occur to him to try to listen for the rhythm; he was only arranging syllables, and did not know that these were the vehicle of a living thing called rhythm. Nor are the Quadrissyllabists interested; they prefer to arrange feet according to size. Certainly, unless we are prepared to swallow cyclic dactyls we cannot arrange dactylo-epitrites into a regular metre of Mendelssohnian elegance; we have to choose between some form of dactylo-epitrite theory and the assorted dipodies. The former, properly understood, gives a metre of uniform rhythm in that (a) it always falls and (b) it is always in the *δακτυλικὸν γένος*;² the irregularity is that, in

¹ Meibom, p. 292.

² This is an exaggeration, but not a gross one. The pure trochee is in the *δακτυλικὸν γένος*; the 'heavy' trochee not far from it.

the dactyls there are four *χρόνοι* to a beat and in the trochee three or four. The other system, with its equal dipodies, is neat to the eye but chaotic to the ear; for in it rising ionics fight with falling ionics, and trochees with iambi, while choriambs look on wondering if they are in triple time and should therefore try to reconcile the ionics against the trochees and iambs; or if they are in duple time and should therefore join the rival, but equally distracted, camp. This rhythmical turmoil would not dismay Hephaestion, but it is not easily to be reconciled with the general idea of Greek rhythms that we derive from the Rhythmic.

There are several other general points that could be discussed without danger of our swerving into constructive criticism, but time is not elastic nor patience infinite. This paper will have served its limited purpose if it has made three points: that the complete rhythm of the choral lyric was presented on three levels at once, that its rhythm, and therefore its metre, was continuous (unlike that of spoken verse), and that the remains of the tradition of the Rhythmic give us no warrant for supposing that the Greek feeling for rhythm was essentially different from ours. It was perhaps more elastic than ours has been during the last three centuries or so, but not essentially different. We must avoid the fallacy of the Metrii, and not think of 'feet' as things apart from rhythm. A 'foot' is only the appropriate means of measuring a given rhythmical phrase; there is no reason to suppose that a phrase must be a certain number of complete 'feet'. Lyric metres must always be difficult and uncertain—so much of the evidence has been lost—but we should not bow down to magic nor abdicate the use of our ears.

H. D. F. KITTO.

University of Glasgow.

THEOCRITUS, ID. ii, 59-62

Θεοτυλί, νῦν δὲ λαβοῖσα τὸ τὰ θρόνα ταῦθ' ὑπόμακον
60 τὰς τῆνα φλᾶς καὶ ὑπέρερον ἀτὶ καὶ νῦν,
[ἐκ θυμῷ δέδεμαι. ὃ δέ μεν λόγον οὐδένα ποιεῖ]
καὶ λέγ' ἐπιτρύζοισα Τὰ Δελφίδος δύτια μάσσων.
60 φλᾶς Π3 μανū prima, v.l. in Σ καθ' ὑπέρε-
ρον Π3 K καθυπέρερον cett. νῦν Buecheler
νῦν Π3 codd. 61 om. Π3 K 62 ἐπιτρύζοισα Π3
ἐπιφθύζοισα codd. μάσσων Ahlwardt πάσσων
codd. καλῶ Π3.

MR. PLATNAUER's remarks on ll. 59 and 62 in *C.R.* vi. 9 f. tempt me to set down my opinion on this troublesome passage, my text of which agrees with Legrand's except that I have taken ἐπιτρύζοισα from the Antinoe Papyrus (which I call Π3),¹ and that I have not accepted his *κα* for *καὶ* in 60. Mr. Platnauer, who is concerned only with the verbs in 59 and 62, says that 'Sympathetic magic demands that the action really performed and that performed in intention should be expressed by the same verb',² and he sees that the two verbs must agree, but he considers μάσσειν inappropriate and πάσσειν appropriate, and therefore rejects Ahlwardt's μάσσων in 62 in favour of ὑπόμακον in 59—an

¹ If ἐπιτρύζοισα is right it will refer to the low or muttered tones in which all incantations are pronounced. Πορείσομαι δούχα says Simaitha (ii). To the evidence collected by Headlam in *C.R.* xvi. 56 add *P. Gr. Mag.* 4. 744. The verb ἐπιτρύζειν is used of sinister muttering by Callimachus at *P. Ox.* 2079. 1. 1.

Magicians who summon dangerous powers to aid them require what the magic papyri call a φύλακτήριον to ensure their own safety. That is why, when Hekate is judged to be at hand, Simaitha raises an apotropaic din of clashing metal (36), and perhaps why her cup wears a woollen fillet (2). On spitting in magic see *Harr. Stud.* viii. 35. It is apotropaic, employed particularly to avert Nemesis (e.g. 6. 39, *A.P.* 12. 229) but also against other uncanny perils (e.g. 7. 127, 20. 11, Theophr. *Ch.* 16. 15, *Tib.* 1. 2. 54 *ter cane, ter dictis despue carminibus*). Ἐπιφθύζοισα is therefore quite as appropriate as ἐπιτρύζοισα, and if the latter is to be preferred it is not on its intrinsic merits, but because, if false, it is hard to see where it came from, whereas ἐπιφθύζοισα may be derived from 7. 127 much as διαθύρρεται at 15. 99 (*διαχρέπτεται* Π3) comes from 6. 15, and κατεράκετο at 14. 26 (*καταφθύγετο* Π3) from 7. 76 or 11. 14.

² 'The same verb or one of kindred meaning' would be more precise, for *αἴων* . . . ἀμαθύνοι in 24 and 26 do not comply with Mr. Platnauer's formula. The trouble about πάσσειν and μάσσειν is that they have nothing in common except letters.

arist imperative of πάσσων which he shows to be defensible.

What verb is appropriate depends on the general purpose of Simaitha's incantation and of the particular instructions she here issues to Thestylis, and Mr. Platnauer does not tell us what he supposes either of these to be. I begin therefore with the whole incantation but may perhaps be allowed to refer to the fuller analysis which I have set out in *J.H.S.* liv. 2. In brief, the incantation consists of nine terms of which the pattern is given by the first, second, sixth, and ninth; each normal term contains a magic act and a prayer (26 *So may Delphis waste in the flames*) or (in the first and last) a statement implying a prayer (21 *I strew his bones on the fire*). In the remaining terms the pattern is varied: one term has neither act nor prayer, another two of each; in one the act is missing, in two the prayers; but the missing act and prayers are easily inferred from the context. The first eight statements or prayers are these:¹ (1) I burn his bones, (2) May he waste away, (3) May he melt, (4) May he revolve about my door, (5) (May Artemis move his heart), (6) May he forget my rivals, (7) May he come to my house, (8) (May the fire treat him like these relics). Of these 4, 5, 6, and 7 are plainly love-spells, and since the recurrent *ἴρυξ ἔλκε τὸ τῆνον ἐμὸν ποτὶ δῶμα τὸν ἄνδρα* makes it plain that the incantation has but one purpose there can be no doubt that 1, 2, 3, and 8 are of the same nature, and that where a symbol is burnt with the intention of subjecting Delphis to similar treatment the fires invoked for him are those of love, which, as Delphis himself says, often kindles a flame hotter than a volcano (133). The idea is too common in poetry to need further illustration,² but for the withering and

¹ As the order is not here material I enumerate them as they stand in printed texts. In my fuller discussion I have given reasons for accepting the order of Π3 K, which place 27-31 after 42.

² See, in addition to the passages quoted below, 7. 55, 11. 51 (with *C.Q.* xiii. 20), Headlam on Herodas 1. 38.

wasting properties of such fires we may recall that Simaitha, like Polyphemos at 11. 69, is reduced to skin and bones (89) : and see 3. 17 ("Ἐρως) με κατασμύχων καὶ ἐσ ὄστεόν ἄχρις λάππει, 7. 102 "Ἄρατος ὑπ' ὄστεόν αἰθετ' ἔρωτι, 30. 21 τῷ δ' ὁ πόθος καὶ τὸν ἔσω μνεῖὸν ἐσθίει. Proof, if further proof be needed, that these spells are intended not to damage Delphis but to inflame his passions, is provided by the numerous and unambiguous parallels in the magic papyri, of which one will here suffice. I take it from an ἀγωγὴ¹ ἐπὶ ζ ὑρῆς ἐπιθυμένης at *P. Gr. Mag.* 4. 1496, where the orders to the burning myrrh are μὴ εἰσέλθης αὐτῆς διὰ τῶν ὅμματων . . . ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ ἔμμενον αὐτῆς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ καῦσον αὐτῆς τὰ σπλάγχνα, τὸ στήθος, τὸ ἤπαρ, τὸ πνεῦμα, τὰ ὄστα, τὸν μνεῖον, ἔως ἐλθῇ πρὸς ἐμέ, τὸν δεῖνα, φιλοῦσά με.²

Throughout the incantation, therefore, Simaitha is trying to attract, not to injure, Delphis,³ and the ninth term which we are discussing must conform to the rest. Now if it were a curse, *Schadenzauber*, to say, as Mr. Platnauer bids Thestylis say, 'I sprinkle (or scatter) the bones of Delphis' would be well enough; but if it is love-magic then you must sprinkle them in some specific and appropriate place—and that is what Simaitha orders Thestylis to do in 21, where the place is the fire and the result will be to kindle the fires of passion. Therefore I assert that without such qualification πάσσω is not in this place an appropriate verb, whereas μάσσω, if it means *knead*, is so. The effect on Delphis will be to soften his bones, and it will resemble that aimed at in 26 (ἀμαθύνοι) and 29 (τάκοιτο) or

¹ Simaitha's word καταδεῖν (3, 10, 159) is colourless, and appropriate to any magical constraint. *Kαράδεσμος* and *φιλτροκατάδεσμος* are used of love-charms (*P. Gr. Mag.* 4. 296, 395), but the more precise word in the papyri is ἀγωγή.

² For further illustrations see H. Schweitzer, *Aberglaube u. Zauberei bei T.* (Basel, 1937), 43.

³ There is of course an element of the vindictive in Simaitha's passion, and it is possible that at 160 she really contemplates murder. The κακὸν ποτόν of 58, however, as I have said elsewhere (*C.R.* lii. 144), I take to be a potent philtre which, if it does not cure, may kill.

produced on Daphnis at 1. 66, 7. 76, Galateia at 6. 27, Polyphemos at 11. 14, Kyniska at 14. 26. He will become feeble like Bukaios at 10. 3; like T. himself at 29. 24 μαθακόν ἐκ οὐδαρίων.¹

When however Mr. Platnauer says he is 'not here concerned with the generally excised l. 61 or the corrupt l. 60' I do not think he treats us quite fairly, for l. 60 is an integral part of Simaitha's instructions to her agent and it may be that Mr. Platnauer sees in it some qualification of ὑπόπαξον which will make that verb more relevant than I think it. Not knowing how he understands the words, I will only say that the sprinkling of Delphis's bones on his own doorstep or thereabouts seems to me as a love-charm no more likely to be efficacious than sprinkling them to the four winds. I must however explain how I understand l. 60 myself, for as it happens those who accept, as I do, μάσσω in 62 commonly assign to 60 a meaning which deprives that verb also of relevance.

First as to the text. L. 61 need not detain us; it is omitted by K and *P. Gr. Mag.* 3, and its second half is borrowed, with an inappropriate change of mood, from 3. 33. As to the last word of 60, Wilamowitz has offered two highly diverse but equally unsuccessful defences of νῦν,² and Buecheler's νύξ is so simple and fits the scholium ἔως ἔτι ἐνδέχεται καταδεθῆναι αὐτὸν so well that it would be unlucky if it were not true.³

Φλά is ambiguous. Its common meaning is *doorpost*, *παραστάς*, but at *Ap. Rh.* 3. 278 and in *LXX* (*Ex.* 12. 7, 22, 23) it means *lintel*. L. and S. in their afterthoughts say 'some under-

¹ I do not understand Mr. Platnauer's objection that *knead* is not the right verb for θρόνα or for σύρια. If it is right for bones then it is right for whatever represents them. Θρόνα means, and is regularly glossed, φάρμακα, and that is what Simaitha calls all the materials with which she is operating (15). Add to L. and S.'s references for this sense of θρόνα Nic. *Th.* 99, *Al.* 155.

² *Textgeschichte*, 258; *Hermes*, lxiii. 375.

³ If καὶ is to be pressed it will mean 'while darkness, as well as other favourable circumstances, is present': but ἔτι is elsewhere followed by an almost superfluous καὶ. I will not cite 159 (where καὶ με λυπῇ should no doubt be read): but see 8. 23, *Il.* 2. 229, 19. 70.

stand *threshold* in Theoc.' They do; and it would have been charitable to add that the word has that sense at Artemid. 4. 42 and may therefore have it in some other places where the context indicates only some part of a door. It is used to gloss *οὐδός* in Suidas and *βηλός* in the *Etymologicum* and at *Il.* 23. 202. Any one of the four components of a door-frame, therefore, may be meant; and as doors are much employed in magic since they are places where one can be sure of catching those that use them, we cannot determine on *a priori* grounds which is here intended.¹ The compounds of *μάσσειν* are also somewhat elusive in meaning. Ahlwardt himself, in proposing *μάσσων*, said that *ὑπομάσσουν* meant *knäten, schmieren* and did not interpret the passage further,² but almost all who have done so understand the *θρόνα* to be smeared on the lintel or doorpost; and this seems to me to reduce *μάσσειν* to the irrelevance of *πάσσειν*, for I do not see that to smear a man's bones even vicariously on his front door is a likely passport to his affections.³ With Le-grand's translation, *va les pétrir discrètement sur le dessus du seuil de sa maison*, I have no great quarrel, and I agree with him as to the meaning of *φλιά*, but I picture Thestylis not rubbing or kneading the *θρόνα* on the threshold but rather standing on or over it and kneading them in her hands. For *καθ' ὑπέρτερον*, if it is rightly written as two words, I should compare Arat. 498 (of the tropic of Cancer) *πέντε μὲν ἔνδια*

στρέφεται καθ' ὑπέρτερα γαιῆς, | τὰ τρία δ' ἐν περάτῃ. The rite will be the more efficacious if performed at the victim's door, for he must pass the spot in person—perhaps be the first to pass it as he goes abroad in the morning. So, for instance, if you wish to transfer your fever to a neighbour you deposit your nail-parings at his door, or if you wish to make him unpopular you smear on it chameleon's entrails mixed with monkey's urine.¹

One more point. It is T.'s not infrequent habit to round off a paragraph, a song, a poem, and to indicate that it is coming to an end, by an echo of its opening. Wilamowitz² noticed the echo *ῶνασις . . . ὄνασαν* in the paragraph 16. 22–57, and in that most elaborately finished of T.'s poems it may be added that the Muses and Graces at the end of the last paragraph (107, 104) echo respectively the beginning of the paragraph (58) and the beginning of the Idyll (6). Similarly *ἀλβίω* at 17. 117 echoes *οὐλβω* at 95, and in this very Idyll 160 *τὰν Ἀιδαο πόλαν, ναὶ Μοίρας, ἀράξει* echoes 6 *οὐδὲ θύρας ἀράξεν*, and the address to the moon (165) not only the refrain of 69 ff. but the address at 10. At 10. 24 Bukaios's song, after an opening invocation, contains six couplets of which the last like the first begins *Βομβύκα χαρίεσσα*, and an echoing vocative concludes Daphnis's song in *Id.* 6 (6, 19), and the first part of the goatherd's in *Id.* 3 (6, 22). The echoes, it will be observed, though quite audible, are discreet, and in the first and last terms of Simaitha's incantation, 18 *ἐπίπασσε Θεστυλί . . . καὶ λέγε ταῦτα Τὰ Δέλφιδος ὄστια πάσσων, 59 Θεστυλί . . . ὑπόμαξον . . . καὶ λέγε . . . Τὰ Δέλφιδος ὄστια μάσσων*, the vocative, sufficient elsewhere by itself, is reinforced by the verbal similarity of the words she is to

¹ Ancient superstitions concerning doorways are collected by M. B. Ogle in *A.J.P.* xxxii. 251.

² *Zur Erklärung d. Idyllen Theokrits* (Rostock u. Leipzig, 1792), 117.

³ *Μάσσειν* means to *knead, work with the hands*, and so *δασ-, ἀνα-, ἐμμάσσειν*. The two last have also senses like those of the *ἀπ-, ἐκ-, περ-, προ-* compounds, where the idea is rather of wiping or taking an impression. I do not think, however, that *smear* is an impossible meaning for *ὑπομάσσουν*. Mr. Platnauer, by the way, should not say that this compound does not occur, for it appears in an obscure and anonymous citation in Suidas, s.v. *ὑπομεμαγμέν-*, where it is glossed, apparently from some second passage, *ἀνατεψυμέντ-*. The exact force of the preposition I will not attempt to determine.

¹ Plin. *N.H.* 28. 86, 117. In T. the *θρόνα* are surrogates for the bones of Delphis, not, as here, materials in themselves noxious. Therefore I do not think the *θρόνα* need come into contact with the door. The important point is the kneading, and what Thestylis will leave in the doorway will be the influence resulting from that operation. The interpretation of *καθ' ὑπέρτερον*, however, is a minor point.

² *Textgeschichte*, 58.

utter¹ and by the fact that of the nine rites these two alone are entrusted to the maid and alone substitute statements for prayers. That is already a far louder echo than T. allows himself elsewhere.

¹ Hence no doubt the origin of *πάσσω* in 62: it comes from 21. *Kai* of *θε* is pretty plainly due to *καὶ νῦν* at the end of the previous line and is no foundation for the emendation which Dr. Schweitzer has built upon it.

where, and if he wrote *ἐπίπαξον* . . . *πάσσω* in 59, 62 I should consider him to be displaying not his verbal artistry but a lamentable poverty of invention. I do not say that he nowhere displays such poverty, but I do say that in this poem at any rate we have no right to suspect it.

A. S. F. Gow.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

STATIUS, SILVAE, 2. 1. 130

iam tamen et validi gressus mensuraque maior
cultibus, et puro visa decrescere vestes.
cum tibi quas vestes, quae non gestamina, mitis
festinabat erus? brevibus constringere laenis
pectoris, et angusta telas artare lacerna, 130
enormes non ille sinus, sed semper ad annos
texta legens . . .

sic M. angustos artus iactare lacerna enormi non
ille sinens. Markland: *angusta talari artare lacertos*
sinens Macnaghten: *brevibus non stringere*
laenis pectoris et angustante alas artare lacerna
Postgate.

Markland's note on this passage well sums up the difficulties which editors and translators have always noticed in it, not that his proposed alteration helps matters. If, however, we answer his most acute question: 'sed quid esset quod sequitur, festinabat arctare telas angusta lacerna? quid est arctare telas, aut qua notione sumendum? re vera non intellego': we may solve the problem.

It seems apparent that *telae* can only mean 'cloth', 'material' actually in the process of spinning or weaving, or when direct reference is made to those processes. Whether it can mean *tunica*, as Vollmer, without giving any authority, states—'diese Kleidungsstücke legen sich knapp an die Brust oder drücken die tunica (telas) eng zusammen (artare)'—I greatly doubt. The answer to Markland's query thus is, that the words have no meaning, a fact which becomes apparent in translations. I quote a few of the more noteworthy: (i) 'He would fasten a short tunic on thy chest, and contract the web with a narrow cloak'—Mozley, in a footnote: in his text he follows Postgate, and renders: 'he constrained not thy breast in a narrow tunic, nor cramped thy shoulders in a straitening cloak';

(ii) 'He would fasten the short cloaks about the boyish chest, and contract the web of the narrow mantle'—Slater, also Macnaghten, *Journ. Phil.*, 1891.

Those who desire to alter *telas* must therefore be right, and Postgate's *alas* is a trial in the right direction. P. was, however, misled on two points: (i) that *ala* can mean 'shoulder': as a matter of fact, we have no evidence that it can; (ii) that *constringere*, *artare*, *angustus*, *angustare* imply an excessively tight and uncomfortable restraint. This can be shown not to be the case. (If it were, we might well expect to find at least one of these words in Ovid's description of the awkward attempts of Hercules to don feminine clothing (*Fast.* 2. 318 ff.)—but in fact not a single one does there occur.)

Consider now the following examples: Ov. *Ars Am.* 3. 274: 'angustum circa fascia pectus eat': Claudio, *Paneg.* (28) 526: 'mater . . . (puellae) viridi angustat iaspide pectus': Jerome *Epp.* 64. 18: 'zonam illam, qua sacerdotis pectus artatur, et linea tunica constringitur': and, with parts of the body other than *pectus* as object, Tert. *de Cult. Fem.* 1. 2: 'circulos . . . quibus brachia artantur': Jerome, *Epp.* 38. 4: 'mitellis crispantibus vertex artabatur'.

These instances (which could be multiplied), and especially Jerome, *Epp.* 64. 18 (which seems almost a verbal echo of our passage), if investigated, show clearly that the words *constringere*, *artare*, *angustus*, *angustare*, far from implying any discomfort, actually describe a close and accurate fit of a garment—that of made-to-measure clothing, in fact (ll. 131-2).

(Note that ll. 126-7 of our passage do not imply that Glaucias had outgrown his clothes: *visae* means 'seemed', not, as Vollmer, 'man sah, wie sie ihm zu klein wurden'; and the sense is that the boy's development was so rapid that dress of a more mature style would not seem inappropriate. Such clothing Melior proceeded to supply, viz. a *laena* and *lacerna*. The lines are a *locus communis*: cf. 2. 1. 40, 109; 2. 6. 49; 3. 3. 68; 4. 4. 45; 5. 2. 13).

Now, the *lacerna* fitted closely to the body at one point only, the shoulders. Thence it flowed evenly downwards and outwards. Martial implies that, if it fitted ill about the shoulders, it appeared slovenly and inelegant (6. 59. 5 'lacernae tollere de scapulis quas levis aura potest').

Using this last passage, then, both as example and as confirmation, I would read *scapulas* for *telas* in our text, and translate: 'He made a little

tunic a perfect fit about his chest, and put closely about his shoulders a tailored cape.' This gives not only very good sense but also an exact parallelism between *constringere—artare, pectora—scapulas, and laenis—lacerna*.

The corruption may be explained as follows: *-sta* displaced *sca-* (our MSS. often confuse *c* and *t*: compare *Silv. 2. 1. 113 amittu* M for *amictu*; *114 Actica* M for *Attica*; *197 tatio* M for *tacito* m.), and the scribe found himself left with the unintelligible *-pulas*, which he then altered to a word which he knew, *telas*. The confusion of *p* and *t* is less obvious, but cf. 2. 7. 96, where L and P have *prementis*, while the *docto-rum conjecturae nullo nomine editae* have *trementis*, now the universally accepted reading. On this question as it affects the *Silvae*, see D. A. Slater in *C.R.* xxvi. 257 f., and R. Ellis in *C.R.* xxii. 125.

W. R. SMYTH.

University College, Swansea.

AN ANCIENT ARMoured FORCE

As one of the units of the army of Antiochus, Polybius (xvi. 18. 6) mentions ἡ κατάφρακτος ἵππος, but his description is not very informative—τελευταῖα δ' ἦν ἡ κατάφρακτος ἵππος, οἰκεῖως τῇ προστηρορίᾳ τῶν ἵππων καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐσκεπασμένων τοῖς ὅπλοις (xxx. 25. 9). Plutarch, who refers on several occasions to ἡ κατάφρακτος ἵππος or οἱ κατάφρακτοι ἵππεις, is rather more helpful, but the earliest detailed account in Greek literature of the equipment and fighting powers of the cataphracts is apparently given by Heliodorus (*Aethiopica*, ix. 15 ff.). Xenophon (*Cyropaedia*, vi. 4. 1, vii. 1. 2) has something to say about somewhat similar cavalry in the army of Cyrus; but he does not use the term *κατάφρακτος* and there is no reason to believe that a force such as Polybius mentions and Plutarch and Heliodorus describe was known in Xenophon's time.

According to Heliodorus the cataphract was a man of exceptional physique who was almost entirely encased in armour. His head and neck were protected by a helmet, made in one piece, which covered all but his eyes; the front

of the helmet represented the human face like a mask. His body from neck to knee, including his arms, was protected by a coat of mail consisting of overlapping metal plates so joined as to prevent undue pressure on the body and to give enough elasticity to permit some movement. In order that the rider might be able to grip the sides of his horse, his thighs were left uncovered, but nothing else. Greaves extended from foot to knee, where they overlapped the bottom of the coat of mail. The horse was similarly armoured; head and legs were completely protected, and over the back was thrown a coat of mail, made like the rider's, of which the two sides met, but did not join, under the belly. By way of offensive armament the rider held in his right hand a long and heavy spear (*κοντός*); the point of the spear, which was carried horizontally, protruded some distance in front of the horse's head; the shaft was supported by a loop attached to the horse's neck, while the butt end came up against its thigh. All that the rider had to do was to steady and direct it; when it found

a target it did not slip back, but was driven forward by the weight and impetus of the horse, so that often—so says Heliodorus, and Plutarch agrees (*Crassus* 27)—it would pass through two enemies at once. For secondary armament a sword hung from the rider's side, but this, for reasons which will appear, was not of much practical value.

Man and horse, so equipped, have more than a little in common with the modern tank, and squadrons of cataphracts were used for much the same purpose as squadrons of tanks, to make a gap in the enemy's lines which could then be exploited by supporting troops. But cataphracts, like tanks, had their weaknesses. They had three vulnerable points, eyes both of man and of horse, horse's belly, and man's thighs when dismounted; the most vulnerable points of a tank, apart from the tractors, are the vision slits and the belly. Both cataphract and tank depend on motion for a great part of their effectiveness; once brought to a standstill each loses much of its power. It is interesting therefore to note the tactics which the Aethiopian king in Heliodorus' story employed against the attack of the Persian cataphracts. He planned his defence in depth. The main point of resistance, some way back, was a line of armoured elephants carrying on their backs towers manned by bowmen (the elephants had such thick skins that for their protection art could make only slight improvements on nature!), but well in front of them was a thin line of light-armed troops. The orders to the forward troops were to slip between the horses' legs of the attacking cataphracts and to rip open their bellies. This they did with fair success and proceeded to make short work of the thrown riders, who, owing to the weight of their armour, could neither run away nor effectively use their swords, but at the same time exposed their unprotected thighs to attack. Nevertheless many of the cataphracts succeeded in getting through this first line of defence and bore down on the elephants; but they were met by such a cloud of arrows aimed at their eyes that most of them were soon im-

mobilized, and the survivors, having tried in vain to break through the solid barrier presented by the bodies of the elephants, retired in disorder. *Mutatis mutandis* a tank attack in modern warfare might be countered on similar lines.

While his account of the actual battle may be partly fanciful, there is no reason for supposing that in his description of the equipment and potentialities of the cataphracts Heliodorus is drawing to any large extent upon his imagination. In fact his composite picture and most of his points of detail are confirmed by scattered remarks in earlier and later Greek and Roman literature. The comprehensive metal casing is implied by Plutarch, who contemplates, however, a rather larger area of unprotected leg (*κνήμας τε καὶ μηρούς, ἀ μόνα γυμνά τῶν καταφράκτων ἔστιν*, *Lucullus* 28); by Sallust, *Hist. Frag.* 4. 66: 'equites cataphracti, ferrea omni specie'; and by Servius on Virgil, *Aen.* xi. 768 ff.: 'cataphracti equites dicuntur qui et ipsi ferro muniti sunt et equos similiter munitos habent.' Heliodorus' description of the structure of the coat of mail (*καταφράκτης*) is supported by Tacitus, *Hist.* i. 79 (' *tegimen ferreis laminis aut praeduro corio consertum*'); by Curtius Rufus, iv. 35 ('*equitibus equisque tegumenta erant ex ferreis laminis serie inter se conexitis*'); by Ammianus Marcellinus xvi. 10. 8 ('*laminarum circuli tenues apti corporis flexibus ambiebant per omnia membra diducti, ut quocunque artus necessitas commouisset uestitus congrueret iunctura cohaerenter aptata*'); and by Claudian, in *Rufinum*, 2. 357-8:

coniuncta per artem

flexilis inductis animator lama membris.

The statuesque appearance of the cataphract and his immobility apart from his horse are also noted. Heliodorus writes (ix. 15) *κατὰ τῶν ἐναντίων ἵεται σιδηροῦς τις ἀνὴρ φαινόμενος η καὶ σφυρήλατος ἀνδριὰς κινούμενος*, and Ammianus Marcellinus (loc. cit.) re-echoes, with some embellishment, 'cataphracti equites, quos clibanarios (baking-tin men) dictant, personati (cf. Heliod. *οὐφιν ἀνδρὸς εἰς ἀκρίβειαν ὥσπερ τὰ προσωπεῖα σοφιζόμενοι*) thoracum muniti tegminibus et limbis ferreis cincti, ut Praxitelis manu

having
the solid
of the
Mutatis
ern war-
ar lines.
l battle
reason
tion of
of the
ring to
nation.

nd most
ned by
d later
e com-
ied by
ever, a
ed leg
và τῶν
(28); by
s cata-
nd by
'cata-
si ferro
unitos
of the
ταφρά-
st. i. 79
aeduro
fus, iv.
a erant
exis')

io. 8
porporis
embra
cessitas
t iunctu-
nd by

bris.
e cata-
om his
writes
δηροῦς
ῆλατος
s Mar-
some
quites,
dicti-
ἀνδρὸς
σοφί-
inibus
manu

polita crederes simulacra, non uiros';
see also Claudian, *in Rufinum*, 2. 359-60:

credas simulacra moueri

ferrea cognatoque uiros spirare metallo

and *de VI consulatu Honorii*, 572-4:

num Lemnius auctor

indidit hinnitum ferro simulacraque belli
uiua dedit?

As for the immobility of the riders, Heliodorus says that they could not even mount their horses without assistance, and when thrown from their horses they lay like logs (*κορμῆδον*, an expressive coinage); and Plutarch writes of them ἔγκατωκοδομημένοις ἔσκασιν (*Lucullus* 28). Livy accounts for the discomfiture of one of Antiochus' squadrons by the words 'propter grauitatem tegumentorum armorumque oppressi' (xxxvii. 42. 2), and Tacitus (*Hist.* i. 79) describes the heavy armour as 'inhabile ad resurgentum'.

That the characteristic offensive weapon of the cataphract was the *κοντός* is indicated by several passages in Plutarch, though Roman writers do not seem to say much about it; but see Tacitus, loc. cit. Plutarch makes the same claim as Heliodorus for its power (*Crassus* 27: παχὺν ἐπωθούντων τῷ σιδῆρῳ τὸν κοντὸν εἰς τοὺς ἵππους πολλάκις δὲ καὶ διὰ δυοῦ ἀνδρῶν ὑπὸ ρύμης διαπορεύομενον); but he also states, what is implied by Heliodorus' account of the battle, that the *κοντός* was the cataphract's only effective weapon—μία γάρ ἀλκὴ τῶν καταφράκτων κοντός· ἀλλο δ' οὐδὲν οὐθ' ἔαντοις οὐτε τοῖς πολεμίοις χρῆσθαι δύνανται (*Lucullus* 28). One point even of Heliodorus' account of the defensive tactics of the Aethiopians is confirmed by Plutarch, who says (*Crassus* 25) πολλοὶ δὲ τοὺς ἔαντων ἀπολείποντες ἵππους καὶ ὑποδυόμενοι τοῖς ἐκείνων (sc. τῶν καταφράκτων) ἔτυπτον εἰς τὰς γαυτέρας; but he also mentions another way of countering the cataphract; this was to come in from the flank and either to knock the *κοντός* from the rider's hand (*Lucullus* 28) or to seize it and by its aid twist the rider out of his seat (*Crassus* 25). Similar measures are implied, if not explicitly stated, by Heliodorus, who tells how the Persian cataphracts, when held up by the elephants, were attacked

by troops who had been taking cover behind the elephants—οἱ δὲ (κατανηλίσκοντο) ὑπό τε τῶν Σηρῶν ὑπό τε τῶν Βλεμμάνων ὥσπερ ἐκ λόχου τοῦ ἐλέφαντος ἐκδρομάς τε ποιουμένων καὶ τοὺς μὲν τυράσκειν εὐστοχούντων, τοὺς δὲ κατὰ συμπλοκὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ἵππων εἰς γῆν ὥθουντα (ix. 18).

Cataphracts were a product of the East; see Julius Valerius i. 35: 'unde (ex Syria) mille etiam cum cataphractis uiros accipit (Alexander), quod armaturae genus orientis inuentio est'. They came to the notice of the Romans particularly in connexion with Antiochus (see Polybius, loc. citt.; Livy xxxv. 48. 3 and xxxvii. 40-2); but they were also associated with the East in general (e.g. Propertius iii. 12. 11-12; Virgil, *Aeneid*, xi. 768 ff.). From Tacitus, however, we learn that European peoples also had their cataphracts under that or another name (*Hist.* i. 79; *Ann.* iii. 43). Perhaps it is because they were normally on the wrong side that we hear from Greek and Roman authors more about their failures than about their successes; and yet, in view of their weaknesses, it seems unlikely that they would very often be effective against well-organized and determined opponents. Still, for one reason or another, the Romans did eventually adopt cataphracts as a part of their own army. The earliest recorded instance belongs to the beginning of Hadrian's reign (C.I.L. xi. 5632: 'praefecto alae I Gallorum et Pannonicorum catafractatae'). Though from that time on references to them on inscriptions and in historians are not infrequent, it seems that they remained essentially foreign and that they were rarely, if ever, recruited from the Romans themselves; in any case Livy's attempt to foist upon them a Latin name ('loricati' xxxv. 48. 3, xxxvii. 40. 5) bore no fruit. What success the Romans may have had with them there is no way of telling. There is evidence that in the third century A.D. the Romans considered that they had done well if they overcame enemy cataphracts (Lampridius, *Severus Alexander*, 56), and that an army of their own was the stronger for an armoured squadron (Vopiscus, *Aurel.* 11). On the other

hand, the impression given by Ammianus Marcellinus and Claudian in the late fourth century is that they rated cataphracts more highly as a show piece for a military review than as an effective fighting force, and Vegetius, in the same century, does not give a very flattering estimate of their value. He sums up their strength and weakness in the following words (*De re militari* iii. 23): 'cataphracti equites, propter munimina quae gerunt a vulneribus tuti, sed propter impedimentum et pondus armorum capi faciles et laqueis frequenter obnoxii, contra dispersos pedites quam contra equites in certamine meliores, tamen aut ante legiones positi aut cum legionariis mixti quando communis, hoc est manu ad manum, pugnatur, acies hostium saepe rumpunt.' Against unprepared or disorganized troops the attack of a squadron of cataphracts might well be

'ΑΡΒΗΛΟΣ

THE ἄρβηλος, described by Sir D'Arcy Thompson in *C.R.* lvi (1942), pp. 75-6, is represented, either in use or in the rack, in pictures of shoemakers on Attic vases in Boston, Oxford, and the British Museum: see *C.V.*, Oxford, p. 100. My shoemaker, the late Sydney Holland, told me that it was used when he was young, and was known as a 'clicker's knife'.

J. D. BEAZLEY.
Oxford.

KINEIN TON 'ΑΦ' ΙΕΡΑΣ

THE proverbial phrase κινεῖν τὸν ἄφ' ιερᾶς (sc. γραμμῆς λίθον) has been—generally, I believe; at any rate by L. and S., old and revised, and the *Dict. of Ant.*, s.v. *latrunculi*—taken to mean 'trying one's last chance'. Pollux, ix. 27, informs us that in the game alluded to both players had five pieces on five lines, the middle one of them being called *ιερά*. Eustathius, 633, repeats the last part of this, and adds that it is so called ἐπειδὴ ὁ ἡττώμανος ἐπ' ἐσχάτην αὐτὴν ἴετο, and therefore the proverb is applied ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπ' ἀπογνώσεις δεομένων βοηθειῶν ἐσχάτης.

Philo in three places, which have escaped the notice of lexicographers, uses the phrase ἀργεούσαι ἄφ' ιερᾶς: *De Som.* ii. 119 τὸ λεγόμενον ἄφ' ιερᾶς ἥρχετο (the reference is to a story that Xerxes, having transformed earth into sea, by cutting through Mount Athos, attacked heaven also, by shooting arrows at the sun); *De Leg.* 22 τὸ λεγόμενον δὴ τοῦτο ἄφ' ιερᾶς ἥρχετο μεταβαλόν πρὸς τὸ ἀρίθμον (the reference is to Gaius' change of conduct from his earlier excellent behaviour to extreme cruelty); ib. 108 ἄφ' ιερᾶς ἥρχετο τὰ σπέρματα τῆς εἰρήνης ἀπορρέπτειν (ἀπορρίπτων) (the reference is again to Gaius' misconduct).

No one, so far as I know, has commented on

devastating; but if their attack was held, the riders were so badly handicapped by the weight of their equipment that in spite of their defensive armour they were at a disadvantage in combat with more lightly armed but more mobile adversaries. The modern tank, of which the offensive power is perhaps not much greater relatively, is far better equipped for defence; but the fact remains that the tank, like the cataphract, when brought to a halt is comparatively vulnerable and may prove a death-trap for its crew, and that the tactics used by the Aethiopians in Heliodorus' story to counter the attack of the Persian cataphracts are akin to those which have proved most effective in dealing with attacks by tanks in the present war.

R. M. RATTENBURY.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

these passages, but, assuming that we have the same proverb, it is clear that the phrase is not applied to men 'in despair who need help in their extremity'. And the examples cited from Theocritus, Alcaeus, Sophron, and Epicharmus do not really support Eustathius' theory. They need not, that is, mean more than taking very strong measures or putting forth all one's force. The one possible exception is Plut. *Cor.* 32, where ἐν χειρῶν πολλῷ καὶ κλύσιν πόλεων the Senate ἀρασα τὴν ἄφ' ιερᾶς ἀφήκεν. Here certainly we have a suggestion of 'the last resource', but a variant for ἄφ' ιερᾶς is ιεράν, and coupling this with the feminine article and the nautical context I suggest that the noun understood is ἀγκυρα. That the 'sacred anchor' was the name given by sailors to the last resource is stated by Lucian, *Fug.* 13. See also *Zeus Trag.* 51.

Unless Eustathius' authority is decisive or my interpretation of Plut. *Cor.* 32 is unacceptable, the natural conclusion is what Philo's use points to, viz. that the stone on the sacred line was the most valuable of the five pieces and that to move it was to put forth one's strongest force. A cautious player would keep it in reserve. Sometimes it might redeem a desperate situation, but this is not implicit in the phrase. To start the game with it is the act of an audacious player and would probably bring that player ultimately to grief as in the spiritual sphere it did Xerxes and Gaius.

F. H. COLSON.
St. John's College, Cambridge.

CICERO, PRO SESTIO 72

quem homines in luctu iridentes Gracchum vocabant, quoniam id etiam fatum civitatis fuit ut illa ex vepreculis extracta nitedula rem publicam conaretur adrodere.

To Mr. G. M. Tucker (*C.R.* lvi, 1942, p. 68) goes the credit for having pointed the way to the emendation of *Gracchum*: 'prominent or peculiar teeth would justify the name and the comment alike'. The rest is easy: read *Broccum*.

O. SKUTSCH.

University of Manchester.

TACITUS, *ANNALS*, xiv. 36. 1

'Ne Suetonius quidem in tanto discrimine silebat: quamquam confidet virtuti, tamen exhortationes et preces miscebat ut spernerent sonores barbarorum et inanes minas.'

Confidet is usually taken as an instance of T.'s use of *quamquam* with the subjunctive to express fact (e.g. by Gerber and Grefe's *Lexicon* and the latest editor, E. C. Woodcock). But the frequency of this construction in T. should not blind us to other possibilities: will it not give better sense to the following words to regard the subjunctive here as due to *oratio obliqua*?

(a) The introductory *ne . . . silebat* is equivalent to a verb of speaking.

(b) *Exhortationes* and *preces* are not sufficiently distinct to be *mixed*. True, *exhortatio (secreta)* is contrasted with *preces (publicae)* in *Hist.* i. 65: but the antithesis there resides mainly in the adjectives. Here *exhortationes* and *preces* are two aspects of the very different line of argument which is added to S.'s statement of confidence in his men's valour. Logically, *exhortationes* and *preces* are subcontraries, and 'mix' more strikingly with the contradictory than with each other.

(c) A Roman historian is not likely to waste words by stating, even in a concessive clause, the truism that a Roman general relied on his legionaries' courage in the face of the enemy: but it is just the sentiment that a historian would put in the mouth of a *dux* addressing his troops, especially as a prelude to *exhortationes et preces*.

(d) This statement of confidence is represented by such phrases as *ferrum virtutemque vincentium* and *toties fusi (barbari)* in the speech that follows.

Translate: 'although, as he said, he trusted in their valour, yet with this expression of confidence he blended exhortations and prayers . . .'

L. J. D. RICHARDSON.

University College, Cardiff.

STATIUS, *ACHILLEIS*, ii. 142

DR. W. Morel in *C.R.* lv, 1941, p. 75, proves the superiority of *intrare* to P's *errare*, but he leaves P's reading unexplained. Though it gives the right general sense, *intrare* is a colourless word, which fails to suggest the difficulty of the task, and I would suggest that *penetrare* is at once more apt and a likelier source of the double reading. If *ardentes penetrare casas* were misread *ardentesque netrare casas* or *ardentesq. enerare casas* (perhaps through unconscious avoidance of the asyndeton), both *errare* and *intrare* would be easy corrections. Statius uses *penetrare* half a dozen times: the nearest phrase is *Thebais*, xii. 198 f., 'me sinite Ogygias, tantae quae sola ruinae causa fui, penetrare domos'.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

REVIEWS

A NEW TRANSLATION OF THE REPUBLIC

Francis Macdonald CORNFORD: *The Republic of Plato translated with Introduction and Notes*. Pp. xxvii+356. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

THE distinctive feature of Dr. Cornford's new way of translating the *Republic*—apart from the soundness and felicity of his work, which there is no need to emphasize here—consists in allowing each step in the argument to proceed without interruption by the merely conventional questions and answers which a modern reader is likely to find tedious. The aim is not merely to excise those conversational oddities which recall the stichomythia of tragedy (some of these indeed remain, as at 459 a) but to suppress anything that hampers the flow of thought. The resulting lucidity is increased by a clear and unaffected English style;

and if its effect is one of smoothness and unfailing fluency rather than of colloquial vigour and soaring eloquence, it is certain that the Greekless reader, for whom the work is intended, will find it much more readable and more immediately intelligible than any previous translation. Plato's longer sentences are divided into manageable sections; his puns and euphuisms are ignored, his irregularities severely called to order, his repetitions removed, and his copiousness trimmed to neatness. The aim has been a clarifying compression throughout; only on rare occasions is the original expanded by incorporating an explanation, as at 544 b (p. 261): 'Let us be like wrestlers, then, who go back to the same grip after an indecisive fall.'

Obscurities are rare. But I think the reader almost bound to misunderstand

what is said of the labourers on p. 57: 'on intellectual grounds they are hardly worth including in our society' (371 e 2). They are, of course, included, though not for their intellectual powers. It may be worth suggesting that at 391 c 2, 597 e, etc., 'third' should be 'second', since the modern reader will not understand inclusive reckoning; and on p. 47 'the just man' should be referred to by 'his' not 'their'. It is curious to observe that C.'s verse lacks the admirable qualities of his prose: 'Dreading the coward's shame no more' (p. 286) lacks the simplicity of *οὐδὲ αἰδεῖται κακὸς εἶναι*.

Many passages, including the fanciful arithmologies and the musical technicalities, are either abbreviated or omitted. The omission of Socrates' argument from 349 b 1 to 350 c 11 because of its 'stiff and archaic form' seems regrettable as depriving Thrasy-machus' blushes of their dramatic necessity. The most remarkable omission is that of 396 c 4-397 b 4 on the ground that Plato's point is 'now sufficiently clear'. A footnote makes partial amends by adding a summary, which, however, is inaccurate, omitting the words, important perhaps for such things as comedy, *ὅτι μὴ παιδιᾶς χάρυν*.

Dr. C. allows himself many smaller liberties throughout; many little words and finer points are abandoned, e.g. 328 e, *γῆραος*, 363 d, the contemptuous *τίνα* in *πηλὸν τίνα*, 375 a 6, *αἰσθανόμενον*, 387 c 9, *λεκτέον*. But positive mis-translations seem almost wholly absent, unless one is to be captious about the rendering of *φρονεῖν* as 'knowledge' (no substitute for 'intelligence') at 367 d 1, or the strange picture at 475 d (p. 178): 'run round at (instead of 'to') all the Dionysiac festivals'; or trivial loose-nesses like 'even stronger words' for *ἔπι τούτων πλείω* at 367 a, or the numerous, unnoted but sometimes substantial, deviations from the Oxford text (p. ix). Where a literal translation might mislead, an interpretation is commonly substituted. C. criticizes the literalness of Jowett's 'virtue' protected by 'philosophy tempered with music' (549 b), and prefers to say that

'the only safeguard' for a man's 'character' (is all 'character' good?) is 'a thoughtful and cultivated mind' — which seems to suggest something less masculine than Plato intended. There are some passages where C. appears to me to reject the better rendering; e.g. I should prefer Adam at 389 d 6, where I do not understand C.'s 'as fatal, if action were suited to the word', and again at 514 a 4, where C. has 'all down the cave'.

The introduction, notes, and explanations are extremely clear and helpful. I have space only for one suggestion and two criticisms. Something might be done for the reader who, having learned of the ideas as 'archetypes of moral and spiritual excellences' (cf. p. 86), meets the ideas of evil and ugliness in more than their usual starkness on p. 179 (476 a). The comments on Plato's treatment of art and poetry fail to do justice either to the kind which he wishes to have or to the kind which he wishes to exclude. In particular, the 'imitative' poetry of 595 a 5 is interpreted as 'the poetry of dramatic representation': but a comparison with (e.g.) 607 b 2 makes it clear that all current poetry, and not merely the formally dramatic, is (with negligible exceptions) to be excluded because 'imitative' in the sense of reflecting the fleeting world of appearance and having no contact with the ideal-real world. Lastly, in such statements as that Pericles had been 'the last philosophic statesman' (p. xxi), that since his day 'the gulf between the men of thought and the men of action had been growing wider' (p. 172), and that Plato wished to 're-unite' (p. xxii) philosophy and practical statesmanship, there is the implication that in Pericles Plato's ideal of the philosophic ruler had been realized, and that Plato thought so too. That Pericles had any real knowledge of right and wrong will be a surprise to those who remember the *Gorgias*. That he gained such knowledge from 'his converse with Anaxagoras' seems a strangely naïve interpretation of *Phaedrus* 270 a.

J. TATE.

University of St. Andrews.

PLATO'S EARLIER DIALECTIC

Richard ROBINSON: *Plato's Earlier Dialectic*. Pp. viii + 239. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press (London: Milford), 1941. Cloth, 18s. 6d. net.

THIS is a valuable work. Applying to the dialogues of Plato the sharpness of logic that marked his study of Cook Wilson, Mr. Robinson sets himself to examine the meaning of the text without prepossessions. His clear forms of expression make it easy for his readers to define their attitude to his conclusions.

Part I gives an account of the Socratic elenchus, Part II of the 'earlier dialectic', which he takes to centre on the use of hypothesis put forward in the *Meno*, *Phaedo*, and *Republic*. He distinguishes between the methodology promulgated and the method used in those dialogues, and seems to find a perhaps disappointing discrepancy in the case of the *Republic*; but since that dialogue represents its methodology (that of the *μακροτέρα ὁδός*) as expressly aimed at the creation of a method different from that used in the dialogue, the situation is complex and seems to demand further examination.

Much of Part I has an historical purpose, being concerned with the genesis of logical ideas and therefore almost as much, sometimes, with what Plato has not explicitly stated as with what he has; but probably the treatment of the hypothetical method, where the historical motive is less prominent, will attract most attention. To some extent it is founded on Part I, where the author, justifiably insisting on Plato's frequent unconsciousness of logical form, analyses his use of self-contradiction in elenchus in a manner which may be thought by some to read into Plato's imperfect forms of expression too explicit a belief in the very odd proposition that a thesis, 'without extra premises', may contradict itself. It must be divisible into two theses, since 'contrariety implies duality',¹ and though Mr. Robinson

rightly observes (p. 137) that it may be hard to settle whether a thesis is composite or simple, can one think of any thesis as self-contradictory without simultaneously thinking of it as composite,—as, in effect, in *Sophistes* 244-5, where Plato finds contradiction within the Eleatic hypothesis by analysing its internal multiplicity?

His way of representing elenctic contradiction influences the author's treatment of *Phaedo* 101 d, where he follows tradition by understanding the words *ἔως ἂν τὰ ἄπ' ἐκείνης* (sc. τῆς ὑποθέσεως) *όρμηθέντα σκέψαι*, *εἴ σοι ἀλλήλοις συμφωνεῖ ἡ διαφωνεῖ* as referring to the testing of the hypothesis by its consequences (although he takes that to be its 'main' rather than its 'primary' purpose), but explains the test in a novel way, on the basis of his treatment of the elenchus, by urging that, however paradoxical it sounds, the consequences of a thesis may so contradict one another as to require it to be abandoned, or at any rate that Plato may have thought so. One hopes that he did not. The theses in question (e.g. *εἴναι τι καλὸν αὐτὸν καθ' αὐτό*, 100 b) may well be more complex than they sound, but unless Plato had explicit consciousness (which he might have communicated to his readers!) of a complexity in them such that one element could lead to *x* and another to not-*x*, the 'dismay' of Plato's readers at his logic which Mr. Robinson mentions (pp. 32, 136) will scarcely be dissipated by the consideration (pp. 138-9) that inconsistency of the consequences 'with each other' may really be a confused way of stating their inconsistency with our standing beliefs or assumptions.

Mr. Robinson gives reasons (pp. 135-6, 141) for either (a) overriding or (b) otherwise understanding Plato's warning that we are to separate the testing of the thesis from examination of the consistency of its consequences; taken as it stands that warning would make their consistency *inter se* a test only of their own validity or consecutiveness as from one thesis, not of the truth of the thesis itself. Whatever weight those reasons have, they are not of direct logical

¹ *Rep.* 436 b. Is it fair to treat that law as if it were an imperfect anticipation of the law of contradiction (p. 3)? It is only with contrariety (e.g. of psychological forces) that the passage is concerned, even if the law can be extended to cover contradictions.

cogency. And perhaps their weight diminishes if we consider the passage as a whole, stopping not at 101 e but at 107 b, since the whole of it is put forward as an *ἐπίθεξις* of the method (100 b 8). Its ending is interesting and relevant. Simmias is praised for wishing to go over again what has been said (*τὰ εἰρημένα*), but reminded that he must also reconsider the original hypotheses (107 b). Is it not implied that, so far, Socrates has taken his own advice not to confuse two issues by simultaneous treatment, and that it is only now that the testing of hypotheses comes into question? Does not Simmias' hesitation, not about them but about *τὰ ἀπ' ἐκείνων ὅρμηθέντα*, help both to define and to explain the real purpose of the test of *συμφωνία* and the necessity of it? At that moment, conscious of 'human weakness' (107 b 1), but with unshaken faith in ideal hypotheses, he would not have agreed that the testing of the validity of the asserted results 'puts a disproportionate emphasis on the minor activity of checking one's logical calculations' (p. 135). It was exactly the activity of 'calculation', not his hypotheses, that he distrusted. And since much of the argument from 101 to 107 (a) is in fact very difficult and (b) turns very largely on parity, or consistency, of reasoning from supposedly similar cases, we can sympathize with Simmias, and perhaps accept consistency of results (granting that it is an insufficiently general formula) as a natural formulation of the principle by which it can be checked.

It may be felt, therefore, that Mr. Robinson's searching examination of

this passage still leaves room for reconsideration; his treatment of the *Meno* also, and his statement of the distinction between mathematical and dialectical method in the *Republic*, as well as his partly new and provocative handling of its 'simile of light',¹ would all merit more than cursory examination if space permitted. But even those who differ most from his conclusions must benefit from the material he has provided for consideration and from his thorough and detailed treatment of the difficulties with which those passages abound.

N. R. MURPHY.

Hertford College, Oxford.

¹ Perhaps its most striking feature—besides its inclusion of what may be the first accurate rendering into English of the 'Line's' opening sentences, 509 d 6 to 510 a 10—is his energetic denial both of correspondence between 'Line' and 'Cave' and of the relevance to the 'Cave' of the distinction between *eikasia* and *πίστις*. But perhaps some will put this question: the 'Line' ends, 'in relation with those four sections (or, classes of objects) there occur these four states in the mind . . .'; *eikasia*, therefore, is the *πάθημα* which occurs when we are *ἐπ' εἰκόνι*; the 'Cave' devises a machinery which keeps the prisoners *ἐπ' εἰκόνα* continuously; why is it not merely syllogism to conclude that the *πάθημα* of the prisoners is *eikasia*? Would not that result, logically, be neither more nor less certain if Plato himself had used the word of their condition? Consideration should be given to the effect of its prolongation, but the *πάθημα* itself must surely be present when its cause is present. So with *πίστις*; the 'Line' prescribes a rule (that his *πάθημα* is *πίστις*) for anyone in a situation defined as being engaged with the originals of shadows (*οἱ ταῦτα ζουτε*); that situation occurs in the 'Cave', not only once but twice; whatever Plato says about the *πάθημα* of the prisoners after release (and he says more than that they are 'in bewilderment'), why do not the situations defined in the 'Line' (and realized in the 'Cave') fall under the rule it has prescribed?

PHILODEMUS ON METHODS OF INFERENCE

Philodemus: *On Methods of Inference*. A Study in Ancient Empiricism. Edited, with translation and commentary, by P. H. and E. A. DE LACY. Pp. ix + 200; photograph of Oxford copy of Herculaneum Papyrus 1065. (Philological Monographs published by the American Philological Association, No. X.) Lancaster, Pa.: Lan-

caster Press (Oxford: Blackwell), 1941. Cloth, \$2.50.

PHILLIP and Estelle De Lacy, both of whom have previously written on questions connected with ancient logic, have produced a full edition of Philodemus' treatise on 'Signs' or 'The Use of Signs' (the title in Greek is uncertain, but *Περὶ σημειώσεως* is probable and convenient)

with text, translation, and explanatory and critical essays. Their work is a valuable contribution towards the understanding of an obscure text on an obscure subject.

The remains of the treatise are considerable, thirty-eight columns of the papyrus together with eight additional fragments, and the text is in surprisingly good condition. The editors have taken Gomperz's text together with many of Philippson's improvements, and have added little themselves; the result is sound, but the difficulty is to understand it. For it is a crabbed and arid bit of writing, consisting of a defence of Epicurean methods of inference against Stoic attacks, and counter-attacks on the Stoic logic. These are in part Philodemus' own, in part taken from other Epicurean writers, Zeno of Sidon, his contemporary Demetrius, and Philodemus' own contemporary Bromius. The main controversy lies between the Stoic method of proof *κατ' ἀνασκευήν*, 'by contradiction' or, as the editors prefer to call it, 'contraposition', and the Epicurean method of analogy. The editors rightly describe the two methods as on the one hand 'rational', 'deductive', and on the other 'empirical', 'inductive'. The Stoic logic rests on the syllogism and concludes intellectually that if *A* is denied, *B* must be denied too, the Epicurean argument on the analogy of the perceptible. Both methods use 'signs', but whereas the Stoic demands a 'sign' that shall be logically conclusive, the Epicureans argue from signs gathered from experience, and make their test of truth the absence of contradictory evidence (*οὐκ ἀντιμαρτύρησος*).

All this is explained—and indeed reiterated—in the editors' essays; but the explanations are couched in a rather narrow technical language not unlike that of the treatise itself. It would have been a greater help to those who are not professional logicians if it could all have been put more simply and brought into relation with the underlying theories of the Epicureans and Stoics. Thus (p. 142) the Epicurean division of the objects of inquiry is given on the evidence of Sex-

tus Empiricus, according to whom objects perceptible in their nature, but at a distance, are regarded as *ἀδηλα*. But in the *Κανονική* of Epicurus himself (D.L. x. 50-2) they are *πρόδηλα*, which are to be regarded as 'problems' (*προσμένοντα*) until we can get close and obtain the clear view (*ἐνάργημα*). This is not a mere technical difference, for to Epicurus the *Κανονική* was a body of rules of procedure in the investigation of nature, and not a logic. The assumption of distant objects under *ἀδηλα* is a proof of the crystallization of 'method' into 'logic', which is no doubt characteristic of later Epicureans, but not of Epicurus himself. Of this change the editors give us no suggestion. Again, there are in the treatise several interesting references to important Epicurean physical theories, particularly in xxxvi. 11-17 to the swerve of the atoms, a passage fuller than any other extant in Greek and a strong confirmation of Lucretius' argument for it on the ground of man's free will. It was not a necessary part of the editing of the treatise to notice such things, but the wider background would have made the edition more interesting to the general student of philosophy.

Similarly the text itself should have had more in the way of detailed annotation. There should have been full notes on technical terms such as *ἀνασκευή*, *ἀναλογία*, *συλλογισμός*, *ἐναργής*, *ἀπαράλλακτος*, *πρόδηλης*, *φανταστικαὶ ἐπιβολαὶ τῆς διανοίας*, terms which, even if they had in some degree changed their meaning and use by Philodemus' time, yet can only be rightly understood from their background in Epicurus.

The translation is careful and for the most part helpful, though its authors are occasionally inclined to 'hedge' at a difficult place. There are some serious mistakes. In ix. 19 *μεῖον φαίνοντα* of the heavenly bodies cannot mean 'appear to be smaller', but 'shine less brightly'; in xvi. 3 *δαμβαλῆ* . . . *ψευδολογίαν* must mean 'abundant', 'frequent', not 'outright' falsehoods; nor should the translation in xxxi. 2-3 of *στε μέν ἔστιν καὶ ἀνόμοια ποτὲ δὲ καὶ ἐναρτία* 'sometimes similar and sometimes dissimilar' have been allowed to stand. These and other

examples are blemishes in a good piece of work.

This edition is bound to be permanently useful, but it would have been more generally valuable if the authors could have got further away from the

technical theories in which they are themselves steeped and given it a wider setting.

CYRIL BAILEY.

Balliol College, Oxford.

TWO MONOGRAPHS ON SYNTAX

Ch. MUGLER: (A) *L'évolution des constructions participiales complexes en grec et en latin*, (B) *L'évolution des subordonnées relatives complexes en grec*. (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, Fasc. 88, 89.) Pp. 172, 132. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1938. Paper, 35 and 25 fr.

(A) PHONETICALLY and morphologically Greek is more akin to Sanscrit and Armenian than to Latin. If, however, one looks to the sentence, one sees a degree of affinity between Greek and Latin unique in the I.-E. family—an affinity due to 'l'impulsion de tendances synthétiques qui, pénétrant d'abord le grec, ensuite, en grande partie par la contagion, le latin, transformant la syntaxe... de ces langues' (p. 167). 'Ce qui caractérise cette nouvelle syntaxe, c'est l'importance qu'y prennent le participe et les constructions participiales' (p. 2). M. sets himself in this elaborate monograph to trace the development of these constructions in the two languages. In the main he is successful, and his tractate may be recommended to all classical scholars interested in Greek and Latin.

Certain criticisms, however, seem called for.

(i) Choice of texts. M. has chosen 'surtout des textes historiques' so as to avoid all confusion of *genre* and date (p. 7). Admirable; but in Greek the authors selected are Homer, Herodotus, Thucydides, and Plato, with one book of Josephus (*Ant. xvi*). Homer is inevitable; but why Plato and not Xenophon? One might also have liked to know how *genre* differs from *genre* in this matter and how these constructions figure, e.g. in Aristophanes, Isocrates, and Demosthenes as well as in Plato. In Latin he might have stopped with Suetonius, as Ammianus' extravagance in this connexion is due to his Greek origin (cf. p. 146).

(ii) M. has a loose notion of what con-

stitutes a 'construction participiale complexe' or the 'amplification' or 'completion' of a participle by another participle or a non-participial subordinate clause. He professes to exclude all cases where 'malgré l'absence de conjonctions de liaison entre les deux participes <or between the participle and the amplifying subordinate clause> il n'y a pas de réelle interdépendance' (p. 26). But his notions of interdependence and 'completion' are obscure. One or two examples must suffice. Of Caes. *B.G.* vii. 82. 2 ('multis undique vulneribus acceptis, nulla munitione perrupta, cum lux adpeteret, veritne... circumvenirentur, se ad suos receperunt') he writes (p. 131): 'ueriti y admet comme complément d'ordre causal l'ablatif absolu *nulla munitione perrupta*, à son tour complété de deux manières, au sens concessif par le second ablatif absolu *multis uulneribus acceptis*, au sens temporel par la subordonnée *cum lux adpeteret*'. In fact *cum l. a.* is independent of (or else completed by) *n. m. p.*¹ In Thuc. vi. 2. 4 (*Σικελοὶ κτλ.*) M. says 'τηρήσαντες, complément temporel de φεύγοντες, est à son tour complété par le génitif absolu de sens temporel *κατιόντος τοῦ ἀνέμου*' (p. 29, cf. p. 51). Here again *τηρήσαντες* is either independent of or completed by φεύγοντες.² Again, it is wrong to say (p. 83) that in Pl. *R&.* 382 A (*οὐκ οἰσθα... μυσοῦσι;*) the 'if' clause amplifies the *ὅτι* clause, as it does in 395 D (*ἢ οὐκ... διάνοιαν*).

¹ In monograph B, p. 33 fin., M. explicitly treats 'completed' and 'dependent' as antitheta.

² It is really the syntax of *κ. τ. ἀ.* (too obscure for the commentators to notice it) that is of interest here. It is surely easier to take the words with *τὸν πορθμὸν* (so L.S.J., *me suadente*) as a bold substitute for a participle agreeing therewith (as in i. 134. 2, ii. 83. 2, etc.) than with *τηρήσαντες* as a substitute for *ὄντες κατίοντες* (cf. B 794, M.'s remark on which [p. 33] indicates that he takes *κ. τ. ἀ.* directly with *τηρ.* in the sense of 'while the wind was blowing down'). That is certainly wrong.)

(iii) *Miscellanea*. While recognizing that Caesar and Sallust are 'sensible-contemporains' (p. 131), M. regularly treats Sallust as senior to Caesar and Cicero (pp. 1, 3 f., 123, 125, 131). This, however, does not affect the substance of his exposition any more than does his predilection for *editiones deteriores* (pp. 10, 121). Not unnaturally M. assumes the existence of a dative absolute in Greek from Homer to Thucydides to have been proved by his article in *R.E.G.* xlix, pp. 38-57, but few will agree with him.¹

¹ The quasi-theological argument with which he seeks to make Hdt. ii. 13. 1 (*Μοίρα κτλ.*) sufficient by

(B) This monograph proceeds on similar lines to those of A and attains a similar degree of success. Here and there it shows signs of haste, as when *quo* is taken as subject of *auspicato* in Cic. *Mur.* 1 (p. 21), *κείων* as transitive in § 425 (p. 10), and *όκως* as final and *πελάσειε* as transitive in Hdt. ix. 74. 1 (pp. 75, 125: on p. 75 Thuc. i. 140. 5 is wrongly, on p. 125 rightly, construed).

W. L. LORIMER.

University of St. Andrews.

itself to establish his case (*R.E.G.*, p. 39) is demolished by Hdt. ix. 74. 1 (δ Σωφάνης . . . ἔχει), etc.

PHILIP V OF MACEDON

F. W. WALBANK: *Philip V of Macedon*. Pp. xi + 387. (Hare Prize Essay, 1939.) Cambridge: University Press, 1940. Cloth, 18s. net.

THIS is a timely work. In a comprehensive history of Philip V it embodies the results of many special studies on the Hellenistic and Roman events of the forty critical years in which Philip ruled Macedon. And it gives life to these results; for from them there emerges a picture of the personality of the king and the conditions in his country. It cannot have been easy to do, since the subject, with its double Greek and Roman aspects, required an historian who could take his stand in a Macedon which touched both worlds. Mr. Walbank was eminently qualified to do this, and it is upon his success here, as well as upon his thoroughness and care, that he must be congratulated. He has written a book indispensable to students of Roman and Hellenistic history alike; or rather he has shown that at this point there must be no distinction between the two in studying Mediterranean affairs.

The book is marked by full, indeed complete, documentation, with its footnotes, survey of sources, and appendixes. There are chronological tables, a bibliography which will be invaluable to students of the period, a good analytical index, and ten clear maps. A word may be said on the composition of the book.

Walbank has followed the severe system of reconstructing the course of events in the light of the authorities before proceeding to general conclusions or characterization. After an introduction on the 'realm of Macedon' and Philip's early years, we find six chapters of close description and analysis of events before reaching a brilliant summary of Philip's policy and character. This is the true historical method, particularly when authorities have to be carefully weighed, and the aims of the book require it. The writing is always lucid and attractive.

The judgement of Philip's character is bound up with the wider problem of the authority of Polybius; for it is Polybius who propounds the celebrated view of Philip's moral *μεταβολὴ ἐπὶ τῷ χείρῳ*. Walbank rightly rejects this picture of Philip 'as a study in psychology, not as a political force', 'the young philhellene who deteriorates into a tyrant, until, like a figure from some ancient tragedy, he brings down his whole house in destruction'. This is to question Polybius' interpretation and broad presentation (and he does seem to have been more under Peripatetic influence than he confessed), but it is not necessarily to depart from his record of events as a basis of criticism and reconstruction. The *μεταβολὴ* could belong merely to a moral interpretation of a political change against the Achaean interests, and

Walbank carefully analyses Philip's changes of policy. Thus the time of the Social War, when he was the 'darling of Hellas', reflects an Hellenic policy in association with Aratus, resisting the Macedonian arguments of Apelles. The *μεταβολὴ* came with his adoption of a western expansionist policy, under the influence of Demetrius of Pharus, which after the Messenian massacre in 215 included domination of the Peloponnese in accordance with Apelles' policy, against the aspirations of the Achaean League. The new policy involved Philip in the First Macedonian War. Walbank rejects the view of a 'fixed idea, inherited from Antigonus, of driving the Romans from Illyria', and treats this policy as a legacy from his ancestor Pyrrhus to Philip's 'romanticism', brought on by Demetrius' influence, seizing the opportunity of an alliance with Carthage. That the policy was a new one, not traditional in Macedon, may well be true, in the light of the evidence; but there may have been more calculation in it, rather than impulse, if we may judge from the limited nature of the alliance with Carthage. Polybius may well have exaggerated Philip's first ideas in interpreting the situation. The times invited an Illyrian venture with immediate gains (for example, against Scerdilaidas) and future prospects in this region through the weakness of Rome under the blows of Hannibal.

The Peace of Phoenice marked the close of this policy, which was influenced by the change in the Hellenistic balance of power, with the eastern successes of Antiochus the Great and the weakness of Egypt. Philip would see the point of returning to the traditional Macedonian policy against Syria in Asia Minor and Egypt in the Aegean. The chapter on the Aegean events from 205 to 200 B.C. is the best account yet written of this period; the treatment of Heraclides' part in Philip's policy is particularly valuable. On the Syro-Macedonian pact against Egypt and the effect of this on Roman policy, Walbank follows the lines of Holleaux's exposition, with which he had earlier associated himself; this is the view imposed by any full

examination of the evidence in Polybius, which is now confirmed in its authority by the implications of the new inscription in honour of Cephisodorus. In reviewing the Roman policy he might have treated with more constitutional emphasis the adoption of the traditional Hellenistic procedure of protecting 'the autonomy of Greece', when, as in this case, some justification had to be found for declaring war in violation of treaty relations which had not been formally broken by Philip.

The account of the Second Macedonian War and Philip's share in the Roman war against Antiochus is concise and clear. The most important contribution in the later part of the work is in the analysis of Macedonian policy from 187 to 179 B.C. 'The recovery of Macedonia' is the subject of a masterly survey of the evidence in its most difficult and tendentious state; for on internal Macedonian affairs Polybius' prejudice is increased by his lack of sound information, and his version has all the appearance of having been elaborated (whether by himself or by his Achaean tradition) after the dramatic fashion of the Peripatetics. Walbank's reconstruction here is particularly good. He shows that Philip now turned to a northern Balkan policy for the rehabilitation of his country; he based it upon extension of power in Thrace, against the interests of Pergamum, and consolidation in Thessaly, and granted a degree of local autonomy, especially in the coastal region, with its trading cities. The new policy caused Roman diplomatic intervention, and difficulties increased with the pro-Roman tendencies of Demetrius. This gives the background for a full treatment of Polybius' account of the death of Demetrius. Philip had to continue his policy under fear of Rome, but (as Walbank well argues) there is little sound evidence that he intended aggression against Rome, or in particular that in 184 he really planned to invade Italy round the Adriatic. But the very restoration of Macedonia, in its 'historic task' of defending the northern frontiers of the Greek world, with the effect of its prestige on Greece and the direct check

to Pergamene imperialism, was later to bring on it the Roman annihilation which Philip feared: 'Dying he left to Perseus a kingdom that was both strengthened and doomed.'

Throughout these political events we see the character of Philip, and it is summed up in a masterly concluding chapter. Energetic, passionate, regardless of Greek susceptibilities when angry, though eager (largely for political reasons) to share in the Greek cults, Philip was an able, but not a great, general, with a certain lack of balance in his statesmanship. The problem of the relation of his varying policies to his different favourites is discussed, but his independence of mind is granted. He is shown as a king well fitted to rule Macedonia, but (mainly for this reason) less adaptable to the diplomacy of the Greek

world. It is a carefully drawn picture, allowing for the effect of political circumstances before making assumptions about character. More weight might perhaps have still been given to political considerations at some points, further discounting the interpretation of Polybius; but the picture is well based and lifelike. It is the mark of this book to combine painstaking research with vivid reconstruction of events and personalities.

This review has dealt with the main lines of the book. The details handled in the appendixes cannot be discussed here; it must be enough to say that they are complete, thoroughly reliable, and scrupulously argued, a basis of any further research on topics with which they are connected. A. H. McDONALD.

University of Sydney.

THE ROMAN IMPERIAL NAVY

Chester G. STARR, Jr.: *The Roman Imperial Navy*. Pp. xv + 228; one map. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press (London: Milford), 1941. Cloth, \$2.50 (15s. 6d. net).

It is long since the last full study of the Roman Imperial fleets appeared; Mr. Starr had a real opportunity, and has made the most of it. He seems to have read everything there is, and has produced a ripe and scholarly book, fully documented, especially as regards the all-important inscriptions, which deserves a warm welcome. He first describes the fleets of Misenum and Ravenna; then come three chapters on their organization and personnel; then the provincial fleets in order, justice being done to *c. Germanica*; and he concludes with an historical chapter on the uses of the fleets. He attributes the organization of nearly all the standing fleets to Augustus; *c. Britannica* was added under Claudius, if it did not really begin with Gaius, and *c. Pontica* under Nero. Vespasian reorganized the navy; after that it just carried on till in the third century it decayed, and the Goths in 268-9 had largely to be met by improvisation; by the time of Constantine the Augustan navy was dead. Every place where an inscription was found was once

called a station of the fleet in question; Starr properly cuts down stations drastically, notably those of the Misenum fleet. For *c. Britannica* (based on Boulogne) he admits Richborough, Lymne, and Dover; I wish he had specifically indicated the failure of evidence for Gloucester (Glevum), once regularly given. He refutes at length Mommsen's views that the crews were originally slaves and freedmen of the Imperial *familia*, and that navarchs (commanders of squadrons) were captains of quadriremes and quinqueremes; Hellenistic organization and terminology would alone negative the latter. The crews were probably *peregrini*; if they ever got Latin rights it was under Vespasian, but Latin names (he points out) do not imply Latin rights. He plausibly explains the large number of Bessi as meaning Thracians generally (as 'Mysians' in Hellenistic armies probably meant Anatolian Highlanders). But on the main crux he can give no help. A ship's organization was Greek, with a Roman military organization superimposed; the ship was commanded by a trierarch, but the crew also formed a century under a centurion. Two commanders in one ship? Starr says there is not the evidence to explain it, but presumably the centurion ranked *below* the

trierarch, though elsewhere he says that trierarchs could not even *rise* to the centurionate before Marcus Aurelius. Small wonder the navy broke down when the Goths made it fight seriously.

Two minor points. The idea that Trajan had a fleet on the Persian Gulf *ut per eam Indiae fines vastaret* is historically impossible; it must, as generally supposed, be the Red Sea, and what lies behind that absurd phrase should be connected somehow with the 'Indian sea', the late Ptolemaic name for the

sea from Bab-el-Mandeb to Cape Guardafui, depot for Indian spices. And Starr adopts the rather common view that under Agricola *c. Britannica* did not circumnavigate Britain but only went to the Orkneys, saw Shetland, and returned down the east coast; this cannot be fitted to Tacitus, who (among many other things) describes with exactness the west coast of Scotland in words inapplicable to the east coast. What Tacitus does say about this voyage needs re-examining.

W. W. TARN.

ET QVIBVSDAM ALIIS

T. R. GLOVER: *The Challenge of the Greek and other Essays*. Pp. x+241; frontispiece. Cambridge: University Press, 1942. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

THE Challenge of the Greek is the criticism which he, as an individualist, would pass on regimented, departmentally ruled, *gleichgestaltet* modern life and on all things dear to the framer of synthetic Utopias, especially in education. Dr. Glover states it twice, once as delivered over the wireless and once as given direct to the Classical Association in 1938, when he called it *Purpose in Classical Studies*. It is worth reading, or re-reading, in both forms. The rest of the book is such a miscellany as might reasonably be hoped for from one who has a proper appreciation of the merits and demerits of Athenaios (the subject of the essay on pp. 131 ff.), and nobly justified himself for writing about that author by claiming (p. 151) that if he knew little of gastronomy he understood irrelevance. Although there are papers on Homer, Vergil (the reviewer confesses to a certain irritation when a man of so much learning and taste persistently and deliberately misspells the name of that poet), and incidentally on Pindar, Plato, and one or two more of the great, much of the book takes the reader along somewhat less familiar paths and treats of matters which can be, but here are not, deadly dull, varying from deforestation in antiquity (pp. 29 ff.) to iced water then and now (pp. 155 ff.). As regards the latter, residence in Canada and visits to the U.S.A. have educated the author's

palate above those of most Englishmen. Being a humanist, Dr. Glover is naturally and intelligently curious and gets knowledge where he can find it; if in a book, so; if from the chat of two commercial travellers (such as those who taught him to understand what an emporium is, p. 72, thus giving an engaging start to a good essay), it is no less welcome.

The book of course makes no pretence to unity or systematization; hence a certain amount of inoffensive re-use of the same material, as on pp. 76 and 91. There are a few inaccuracies: a cicada is not a grasshopper (p. 55 and elsewhere); *πεπάσθαι* in Solon, fr. 1, 7 Diehl, does not mean 'get' but 'possess' or 'be in possession of' (p. 106); Athenaios (p. 142) never says that myrrh was supplied in alabaster vessels, but in alabaster, which might be of any suitable material, those in 686 c being perhaps of gold; and Aristotle (p. 213) did not call Euripides the most tragic of the poets *simpliciter*. It would be interesting to know the grounds for including herrings (p. 109) in the ancient dietary, and the alleged exhalation from the ground at Delphi mentioned on p. 160 was a piece of late and learned rationalizing. Against these may be set, along with much else, the warning on p. 219 to those who fancy that *Quellenkritik* will explain an author of genius, and the delightful test for recognizing an educated man suggested on p. 233.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

Kirropp
(Group)
Collati
161; 2
Christ
sylvan

In this
cism of
structed
stated
which it
three gr
best of
788; c,
this gro
1914-18.
of its re
struct
groups,
reading
can do
the tex
along w
the typ
231-50)

The
introduc

H.
Comea
O. J.
caesu
to pr
such c
delibe
not it
patte
makin
J. S.
plots
and p
of So
émo
son,
ment
again
that
of P
men
men
were
dial
(Con
that
'in
Mac

SHORT REVIEW

Kirsopp and Silva LAKE: *Family 13 (The Ferrar Group)*. The Text according to Mark, with a Collation of Codex 28 of the Gospels. Pp. xiv + 161; 2 plates (photographs of MSS.). London: Christophers (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press), 1941. Paper, 15s. net.

In this valuable contribution to the textual criticism of the Gospels the editors provide a reconstructed 'Ferrar' text of Mark together with a full statement of the evidence of the nine MSS. on which it is based. These MSS. are found to fall into three groups: *a*, containing 13, 346, 543, 826 (the best of this group), and 828; *b*, containing 69, 124, 788; *c*, containing 983 (apparently 1689 belonged to this group, but it has been lost since the war of 1914-18, and there is no sufficiently reliable record of its readings). The editors have tried to reconstruct the common ancestor (*x*) of these three groups, and as they have provided the alternative readings in their apparatus, anyone who thinks he can do better has only to try. The importance of the text here established is that it is a witness, along with other important MSS. and versions, to the type of text used at Caesarea by Origen (c. A.D. 231-50).

The reconstructed text of *x* is preceded by five introductory chapters of the greatest interest and

value. They contain a history of research on the Ferrar group, full descriptions of the MSS., and careful examination of their relations to each other, notes on passages where the MS. evidence is hard to interpret and the ancestor correspondingly difficult to reconstruct, and finally a discussion of the origins of the group. All the MSS. except 69 were written in South Italy, and all except 69 and the missing 1689 are assigned to the tenth and eleventh centuries. The editors (p. 58) 'incline to the belief that the Caesarean text originated in Egypt, but that *x* . . . represents a branch in Palestine or Sinai, though not the branch used by Origen and Eusebius in Caesarea'. The stages between the branch located in Palestine or Sinai and the extant South Italian MSS. can no longer be filled in in detail.

In the Appendix we have: (a) a collation of Cod. 28 of the Gospels; (b) a collation of Cod. 174 in Mark, and (c) a list of the variants of Cod. 124 in Mark which are not mere errors, and not supported by the *Textus Receptus* or by any member of fam. 13.

Once more these indefatigable scholars have placed all students of the N.T. text deeply in their debt.

T. W. MANSON.

University of Manchester.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

XXXVII. 1: JANUARY, 1942

H. W. Prescott, *Exit Monologues in Roman Comedy*: analyses their function and technique. O. J. Todd, *Caesura Rediviva*: the phenomenon of caesura cannot be explained either as an attempt to produce conflict between ictus and accent—such conflict is the result of caesural arrangement, deliberately controlled in developed Latin verse, not its cause—or by O'Neill's hypothetical pitch-pattern; its purpose was to avoid jerkiness by making musical and rhetorical divisions overlap. J. S. Kieffer, *Philoctetes and Arete*: compares the plots of the plays on Ph. by the three tragedians, and particularly the conception of *āperī* in those of Soph. and Eur.; in Eur. *ā* is the political *ā*, of the Sophists, in Soph. it is the *ā* of the *Meno*, *ēποτήμη* obtained by *άνάμνησις*. Richard Robinson, *Plato's Parmenides*: maintains that the arguments in the first part of the dialogue are directed against the existence of forms, not sensibles, and that the doctrine of forms here discussed is that of P.'s earlier dialogues; P. regards these arguments as serious, though he nowhere answers them. The second part is not intended as a statement either of doctrine or of method. Both parts were meant to give Plato's pupils exercise in dialectic and in the detection of errors in logic. (Continued in xxxvii. 2.) Murray Fowler suggests that *āμβporos* combines two words, *ā*+*βporos*, 'incorporeal', and *ā*+*βporos*, 'immortal'. L. A. Mackay, *Notes on Horace*: (i) *Od. 1. i. 1*: if Maecenas has a known ancestor, Perperna's clerk (Sall.,

Hist. iii. 83) may well have been his father; (2) *Ep. 1. i. 38*: the list of sins may go back, like the first Christian list in Cassian (Migne, *xlix. 202*), to Stoic teaching.

XXXVII. 2: APRIL 1942

R. J. Bonner and Gertrude Smith, *The Administration of Justice in Sparta*: catalogues the meagre evidence for criminal and civil procedure. A. A. Boyce, *The Origin of ornaments triumphalia*: the institution of *o.t.* as a conventional honour and part of an imperial military cult should be connected with Augustus' refusal of a triumph in 19 B.C. and the dedication of the temple of Mars Ultor. H. C. Youtie, *Critical Notes on Michigan Ostraka*: gives revised texts of O. Mich. I. 151, 180, 308, 664, 656; eliminates the proper names *Ἀνδρίσκος* and *Ἀράθης*. G. M. Messing, *Remarks on Anthimus De observatione ciborum*: reviews work on the text since the ed. princeps of 1870 and comments on some words and phrases. Richard Robinson, *Plato's Parmenides*, II (continued from xxxvii. 1). J. R. Naiden and F. W. Householder on Manil. I. 431-42 transpose 438-42 to follow 432 and change *quam* (433) to *quae*; *Cetus* is masc., *alter amnis* is Eridanus and *caput* its source. Willy Morel, *Notes on the Ciris*: proposes *67 gravis hydra* for *gravena*, 249 *sordibus et stomacho*, 408 *vos o plumanti*. T. B. Jones, *A Note on Marcus Aurelius Carus*: Carus was a Gaul, not an Illyrian. H. W. Miller lists three- and two-word trimeters in Aristophanes. J. A. Notopoulos on *Poetics 1458^b* 12 proposes *τὸ δὲ μέτριον . . . τῶν μέτρων*.

XXXVII. 3. : JULY, 1942.

A. T. Olmstead, *The Mid-third Century of the Christian Era*: using the Shahpuhr inscription and the thirteenth Sibylline Oracle, sketches the history of the Orient in this period. C. Bonner, *Notes on Aeschylus: Agam.* 744-9, Helen is a bird of evil omen—the keyword is δόνεσθος; 1035-9, takes ἀυγήρος δόμοις as a parenthetical exclamation; 1323-6, with ἡλίου (Jacobs), τὸν ἐμοὺς τιμαόρους (Musp.) and ἐμούς (Schuetz) proposes φόνευτρα in 1323—'that my avengers may pay my enemies the wages of murder for me'; *Cho.* 286-90, rejects πλάστηγε—μάστηγε and translates 'so that he is driven from the city with the gong of wrought bronze'. F. A. Sullivan, *Horace and the Afterlife*. F. Steckerl, *Artefact and Idea*: examines doctrines of paradeigmata of artefacts in neo-Platonic thought. S. T. Vandersall, *Line Omissions in Homeric Papyri since 1932*: continues B. McCarthy's

study of papyri of 1925-32 and finds Bolling's principles for detection of interpolations again confirmed. G. H. Macurdy refers Soph. *O.T.* 873 ff. to Pericles and τὸ καλῶν ἔχον πάλαισμα to his opponent Thucydides, son of the wrestling-master Melesias; these allusions may help to account for the defeat of the play in 429, when P. had returned to office. S. Dow revives Wilhelm's *Διόνεος οἰκλα* in Athen. v. 212 d and collects data to suggest that Dies was a Tyrian from Delos and a leader of the anti-Roman movement in Athens. C. G. Starr on *verna* draws attention to the meaning 'native', probably the original one, and cites examples from C.I.L. A. E. Raubitschek combines *I.G.* ii². 2839 and 2844 and prints a revised text. S. M. Miller on *Petr. Sat.* 62 proposes *strinxi et maturavi et evitavi umbras. tamquam larva intravi*. L. W. Daly on *Mart. viii. 18. 5* explains *Calabri Flacci* as due to misunderstanding Hor. *Od.* iv. 8. 20 *Calabriae Pierides* as a reference to H. himself.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review.

The price should in all cases be stated.

* * * Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Atkinson (D.). Birmingham and Midland Institute. Birmingham Archaeological Society. Report on Excavations at Wroxeter (the Roman City of Viroconium) in the County of Salop, 1923-1927. Pp. xviii+387; 73 plates, 50 figures in the text. Oxford: University Press, 1942. Boards, 21s. net.

Bernheimer (R.) and others. Art: a Bryn Mawr Symposium. Pp. xii+350. Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania, 1940. Cloth.

Donnelly (F. P.) and *Simpson* (F. P.). The Oration of Demosthenes on the Crown with an English Translation and Notes by F. P. S. and a Rhetorical Commentary by F. P. D. Pp. ix+356. New York: Fordham University Press, 1941. Cloth, \$2.25.

Eliot (T. S.). The Classics and the Man of Letters. The Presidential Address delivered to the Classical Association on 15 April 1942. Pp. 27. London: Oxford University Press, 1942. Paper, 8d. net.

Essays by Divers Hands, being the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom, New Series, Vol. XIX. Edited by R. W. Chapman. Pp. viii+156. London: Milford, 1942. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

Forbes (C. A.). Teachers' Pay in Ancient Greece. Pp. 60. (University of Nebraska Studies, May 1942.) Lincoln, Nebraska: The University. Paper.

Glanville (S. R. K.), editor. The Legacy of Egypt. Pp. xx+424; 34 plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1942. Cloth, 10s. net.

Glover (T. R.). The Challenge of the Greek and

other Essays. Pp. x+241. Cambridge: University Press, 1942. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

Kennedy (E. C.). Martial and Pliny. Selections from Martial and Pliny the Younger. Edited with Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary. Pp. xiv+144; illustrations. Cambridge: University Press, 1942. Boards, 3s. 6d. net.

Kinchin Smith (F.) and *Melluish* (T. W.). Catullus: Selections from the Poems. Pp. 126; 4 illustrations. (The Roman World Series.) London: George Allen & Unwin, 1942. Cloth, 2s. 9d. net.

Lehmann-Hartleben (K.) and *Olsen* (E. C.). Dionysiac Sarcophagi in Baltimore. Pp. 80; 45 figures. Published Jointly by the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, and the Trustees of the Walters Art Gallery. 1942. Paper.

Needler (G. H.). The Lone Shieling. Origin and Authorship of the Blackwood 'Canadian Boat-song'. Pp. ix+109; 3 photographs. Toronto: University of Toronto Press (London: Milford), 1941. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.

Skemp (J. B.). The Theory of Motion in Plato's Later Dialogues. Pp. xv+123. (Cambridge Classical Studies.) Cambridge: University Press, 1942. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.

Studies in Honor of Frederick W. Shipley. By his Colleagues. Pp. xi+314; portrait. (Washington University Studies—New Series. Language and Literature—No. 14.) St. Louis, 1942. Cloth.

Webster (T. B. L.). Greek Interpretations. Pp. viii+128; 8 plates. Manchester: University Press, 1942. Cloth, 5s. net.

accent and
Alcibiades
Allen and
89
American
2-4, L
American
summa
angustus
archon-lit
Argenti's
artare, i
ascriptus
audere, a
Austin (C
Bailey (C
Infere
Barnard
Barwick
Caesar
Bates's
Beazley
Bebryke
Bellona
Benedic
BOOKS
Box (H.
Brink (E
de Zie
Brittain
pronun
Bursian
Caclama
Thucy
Caesar (C
Cary's
quiet
cataphr
Clark's
Classical
Classical
(XXI)
Cohoon
Colman
Colson
Phil
Compan
constrin
Cornford
Dawkin
Forst
decuria
De Lac
Diana-
Dioscur
Dobó's
Dunbal
Edward
Fordyc
Dubl
Forster
Forster
Fritz's
frumen
Gasele
the F
Georgic
Giles (A
ship
4593

INDEX

I. GENERAL INDEX

accent and ictus in classical Greek and Latin, 46
 Alcibiades' lisp, 72
 Allen and Garrod's *Opus Epistolarum D. Erasmi* (X), 89
American Journal of Philology summarized (LXI 2-4, LXII 1-3), 51
 American Philological Association, *Transactions of*, summarized (LXXI), 53
angustus ('perfectly fitting'), 112
 archon-lists, 85
 Argenti's *Chius Vincta*, 94
artare, 112
ascriptus, 41
audere, *avidere*, 67
 Austin (R. G.) on Sparrow's *Poems in Latin*, 90
 Bailey (C.) on De Lacy's *Philodemus: On Methods of Inference*, 120
 Barnard's *Imperitis*, 48
 Barwick's *Caesars Commentarii und das Corpus Caesarianum*, 80
 Bates's *Sophocles, Poet and Dramatist*, 27
 Beazley (J. D.) *Ἀρβηλος*, 116
 Bebrykes, origin of, 12
 Bellona-Diana, 19
 Benedict's *A History of Narbo*, 88
 BOOKS RECEIVED, 55, 95, 128
 Box (H.) Cicero in *Verr. i 30: 72*
 Brink (K. O.) on Nuyens's *Ontwikkelingsmomenten in de Zielkunde van Aristoteles*, 31
 Brittain (F.) A French broadsheet of 1582 on Latin pronunciation, 20
 Bursian's *Jahresbericht (Nekrologie*, Bd. 271, 1940), 2
 Caclamanos's edition of Venizelos's translation of Thucydides, 29
 Caesar in the first *Georgic*, 18
 Cary's *Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Roman Antiquities* (III), 33
 cataphracts, 113
 Clark's *Eight American Praxapostoloi*, 77
 Classical Association, meeting of, 1 (cf. 57 and 97)
Classical Philology summarized (XXXVI 2-4), 50; (XXXVII 1-3), 127
 Cohoon and Crosby's *Dio Chrysostom* (III), 76
 Colman (D. S.) on some school books, 48
 Colson (F. H.) on Goodenough's *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus*, 78. *Kweīv rōv dō' lepās*, 116
Comparative Literature Studies (VI-VII), 98
constringere, 112
 Cornford's *The Republic of Plato*, 117
 Dawkins (R. M.) on Argenti's *Chius Vincta* and Forster's *A Short History of Modern Greece*, 94
decuriae, 72
 De Lacy's *Philodemus: On Methods of Inference*, 120
 Diana-Bellona, 19
 Dioscuri, 11 ff.
 Dobö's *Publicum Portorum Illyrici*, 93
 Dunbabin (R. L.) Notes on Livy XXIII: 69
 Edwards (W. M.) Aeschylus *Ag.* 767 f. : 71
 Fordyce (C. J.) on Tate's *Orationes et Epistolae Dublinenses*, 91
 Forster (E. S.) Trees and plants in Herodotus, 57 ff.
 Forster's *A Short History of Modern Greece*, 94
 Fritz's *Pythagorean Politics in Southern Italy*, 74
frumenta, 70
 Gaselee (S.) on Weiss's *Humanism in England during the Fifteenth Century*, 47. On Pulling's *Barbitos*, 49
Georgics I, date of, 18
 Giles (A. F.) on Sherwin-White's *The Roman Citizenship*, 40
 4593, II

Gillies (M. M.) on Stoessl's *Apollonios Rhodios*, 49
 Glover's *The Disciple*, 93; his *The Challenge of the Greek*, 126
 Göhler's *Rom und Italien*, 86
 Gomme (A. W.) on Venizelos's translation of Thucydides, 29. On Schmitz-Kahlmann's *Das Beispiel der Geschichte im politischen Denken des Isokrates*, 32
 Goodenough's *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus*, 78
 Gow (A. S. F.) The twenty-second Idyll of Theocritus, 11. Theocritus *Id. ii 59-62*: 109
 Hamilton (W.) on Cohoon and Crosby's *Dio Chrysostom* (III), 76
 Harden (D. B.) on Wuilleumier's *Tarente des origines à la conquête romaine*, 37
 Harrison (E.) Attic *ἡ* and *ἢ*, 'I was', 6. On Richards's *Housman*, 91
 Harvard Studies in Classical Philology summarized (LI), 53; cf. 1
 Healey's *First Year Latin Reader*, 48
 Heath (T. L.), obituary notice of, 1
 Heichelheim (F. M.) on Dobö's *Publicum Portorum Illyrici*, 93
 Heidel's *Hippocratic Medicine*, 73 [97]
 Hellenic and Roman Societies, joint meeting of, 57.
 Henry (R. M.) on Lind's *Mediaeval Latin Studies*, 37
 Hermathena summarized (LVII, LVIII), 54; cf. 1
 Householder's *Literary Quotation and Allusion in Lucian*, 93
 hymns (Greek), norm for ending of, 16
 ictus and accent, 46
 Jones (W. H. S.) on Heidel's *Hippocratic Medicine*, 73 [99]
 Kitto (H. D. F.) Rhythm, Metre, and Black Magic, Lake's *Family 13 (The Ferrar Group)*, 127
lex Plautia Papiria, 41
 Liddell-and-Scott ed. 9, criticisms of, 65.
 Lind's *Mediaeval Latin Studies*, 37
'line' and 'cave' in the Republic, 120
 Loeb Classical Library: *Dio Chrysostom* (III), 76; *Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Roman Antiquities* (III), 33; *Greek Mathematics* (II), 75; *Remains of Old Latin* (IV), 34
loricati, 115
 Lorimer (W. L.) on Mugler's *L'évolution des constructions participiales complexes* and *L'évolution des subordonnées relatives complexes*, 122
 Macdonald (A. H.) on Cary's *Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Roman Antiquities* (III), 33. On Walbank's *Philip V of Macedon*, 123
 Macdonald (G.), obituary notice of, 2
 Manson (T. W.) on Clark's *Eight American Praxapostoloi*, 77. On Glover's *The Disciple*, 93. On Lake's *Family 13 (The Ferrar Group)*, 127
 Mattingly (H.) Notes on Virgil, 18. On Warmington's *Remains of Old Latin* (IV), 34
 Mugler's *L'évolution des constructions participiales complexes* and *L'évolution des subordonnées relatives complexes*, 122
 Murphy (N. R.) on Robinson's *Plato's Earlier Dialectic*, 119
 Murray's *Sophocles, The Antigone*, 27
 Myres (J. L.) on Teggart's *Rome and China*, 42
 Nuyens's *Ontwikkelingsmomenten in de Zielkunde van Aristoteles*, 31
 Oliver's *The Sacred Gerusia*, 85
 Pickard-Cambridge (A. W.) on Thomson's *Aeschylus and Athens*, 21
 Pignaniol's *Histoire de Rome*, 44

Pirie (J. W.) on Sturtevant's *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin*, second edition, 45. On Richardson's *Agma*, 93

Platnauer (M.) *Xρῆν : ἔχρῆν*, 2. Theocritea, 9 (cf. 109) 'porthole' in Greek, 55

Preiswerk's *Das Einzelne bei Platon und Aristoteles*, 92

Pritchett and Meritt's *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, 84

pronunciation of Latin, 20; of Greek and Latin, 45.

Pulling's *Barbitos*, 49

Rattenbury (R. M.) An ancient armoured force, 113

Richards (G. C.) on Allen and Garrod's *Opus Epistolarum D. Erasmi* (X), 89

Richards's (G.) *Housman 1897-1936*, 91

Richardson (L. J. D.) Tacitus *Ann. xiv* 36 1:117

Richardson's *Agma*, 93

Robertson (D. S.) on Householder's *Literary Quotation and Allusion in Lucian*, 93. *Statius Ach. ii* 142: 117

Robinson's (C. E.) *Romani*, 48

Robinson's (R.) *Plato's Earlier Dialectic*, 119

Roebuck's *A History of Messenia*, 39

Roman and Hellenic Societies, joint meeting of, 57, 97

Rose (H. J.) Aeschylus *Ag. 1091* and *Persae 419*: 71. On Singer's *A Short History of Science to the Nineteenth Century*, 94. On Glover's *The Challenge of the Greek*, 126

Rostovtzeff's *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, 81

Rudorff's Law, 36

Sandbach (F. H.) 'Ακρα Γυρέων once more, 63

Scheps's *Sedulius' Paschale Carmen*, 49

Schmitz-Kahlmann's *Das Beispiel der Geschichte im politischen Denken des Isokrates*, 32

Sepple (W. H.) on Scheps's *Sedulius' Paschale Carmen*, 49

Sherwin-White's *The Roman Citizenship*, 40

Shewring's *Topics*, 50

Siegert's *Die Syntax der Tempora und Modi der ältesten lateinischen Inschriften*, 36

'sigma of Diophantus', 76

Singer's *A Short History of Science to the Nineteenth Century*, 94

Skutsch (O.) on Siegert's *Die Syntax der Tempora und Modi der ältesten lateinischen Inschriften*, 36. Notes on the *Pseudolus* of Plautus, 66. *Cicero pro Sestio* 72: 116

Slater (D. A.), obituary notice of, 2

Smyth (W. R.) *Statius Silvae ii 1 130*: 112

Societies for the Promotion of Greek and Roman Studies, joint meeting of, 57, 97

South African Architectural Record (Jan. 1941), 1

Sparrow's *Poems in Latin*, 90

Stanford (W. B.) Aristotle *Po.* 1457a 22: 72. Alcibiades' lisp, 72

Starr's *The Roman Imperial Navy*, 125

Stevenson (G. H.) on Pignoli's *Histoire de Rome* and Zancan's *La Crisi del Principato nell'anno 69 D.C.*, 44

Stoessl's *Apollonios Rhodios*, 49

Sturtevant's *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin*, second edition, 45

sublata, 70

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 50, 127

Tarn (W. W.) on Pritchett and Meritt's *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, 84. On Starr's *The Roman Imperial Navy*, 125

Tarrant (D.) on Preiswerk's *Das Einzelne bei Platon und Aristoteles*, 92

Tate (J.) on Shewring's *Topics*, 50. Reluctant revision, 65. On Fritz's *Pythagorean Politics in Southern Italy*, 74. On Cornford's *The Republic of Plato*, 117

Tate's (R. W.) *Orationes et Epistolae Dublinenses*, 91

Teggart's *Rome and China*, 42

Theocritus as botanist, 58

Thomas's *Selections illustrating the History of Greek Mathematics* (II), 75

Thompson (D'A. W.) on Thomas's *Selections illustrating the History of Greek Mathematics* (II), 75

Thomson (G.) Aeschylus *Ag. 487* (481) and *Cho. 892* (893): 71

Thomson's *Aeschylus and Athens*, 21

Tod (M. N.) on Oliver's *The Sacred Gerusia*, 85

Tucker (G. M.) Cicero *Sest. 72*: 68 (cf. 116)

Venizelos's translation of Thucydides, 29

Walbank (F. W.) on Roebuck's *A History of Messenia*, 39. On Barwick's *Caesars Commentarii und das Corpus Caesarianum*, 80. On Rostovtzeff's *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, 81. On Göhler's *Rom und Italien*, 86. On Benedict's *A History of Narbo*, 88

Walbank's *Philip V of Macedon*, 123

Warmington's *Remains of Old Latin* (IV), 34

Weiss's *Humanism in England during the Fifteenth Century*, 47

Williams's *Tragedy of Destiny*, 27

Wuilleumier's *Tarente des origines à la conquête romaine*, 37

Zancan's *La Crisi del Principato nell'anno 69 D.C.*, 44

II. INDEX LOCORUM

Note—'passim' means that several passages of the author or work are dealt with at the given place.

Aeschylus passim: 3. *Ag. 487* (481), 767 f., 1091: 71; 1637: 7. *Cho. 892* (893): 71. *Pers. 419*: 2, 71. *Supp. 344*: 9

Amianus Marcellinus *xvi 10 8*: 114

Apollodorus *iii 11 2*: 14

Appollonius Rhodius *i 1207-72*, *ii 1-97*: 11; *iii 278*: 110

Appian *B.C. i 10 41*: 87

Aratus *498*: 111

Archilochus fr. 56 (Diehl): 63

Aristides Quintilianus p. 40 (Meibom): 102

Aristophanes passim: 5. *Ach. 540*: 6. *Lys. 816*: 9. *Nu. 445*: 71. *Pax 1232-4*: 55. *Ra. 1291*: 71. *The. 800*: 71. *Ve. 44 f.*: 72

Aristotle *Po. 1457a 22*: 72

Artemidorus *iv 42*: 111

Caesar *B.C. and B.G.* passim: 80. *B.G. vii 22*: 70; *viii 82 2*: 122

Ciceron *de or. ii 257*: 68. *Sest. 72*: 68, 116. *Verr. i 30*: 72. *Att. v 12 1*: 63

C.I.L. xi 5632: 115

Claudian *de cons. Hon. 572-4*: 115. *In Rufin. ii 357 ff.*: 114, 115. *Pan. 526*: 112

Columella *R.R. xi 2 50*, *54*: 70

Crates fr. 14: 5

Curtius Rufus *iv 35*: 114

Dio Chrysostom *vii 6*: 65; *xxxii-xxxvi* passim: 77

Dionysius Halicarnassensis *R.A. v-vi* 48 passim: 33

Diophantus *Arithm. i. Def. III*: 76

Eupolis (?) ap. Athen. *638 E*: 71 f.; *fr. 120*: 5

Europides passim: 4 f., 7 f. *Alc. 655*: 8. *Andr. 411 f.*: 71; *1001*: 5. *Hec. 13, 15*: 7. *Hel. 992*: 8. *Herac. 246*: 71. *HF 1062*: 99; *1416*: 8. *Hipp. 1012*: 8. *IA 944*: 8. *Ion 280*: 8; *638*: 7. *Or. 377*: 8. *Rhes. 218*: 6. *Supp. 266*: 5. *Tro. 474*: 7; *565*: 5. *Fv. 736 2*: 5, 6; *953*: 5, 7

Eustas
Ev. Ic
Helioc
Hermi
Herod
Home
xvii
Horac
Lamp
Hygin
IG ii²
873
Jerom
Julius
Livy
115
Lucian
LXX
Lycop
Martia
Ovid
Fas
Pallad
Pap.
Pap.
Pausa
Phere
Philo
Philod
Pinda
iii 1
Plato
Plato

άγμα,
άγωγή,
άκανθη
άκρα Ι
άλευρο
άλφιτο
άμπελο
άνθερο
άνησος
άρβηλο
δάσταφ
άτοποι
Άφαρ
βάλανο
βύθος
βύσσος
γερον
Γύρδας,
δεῖ, χρ
δρῦς, ζ
έβενος,
δέα, έ
είκασί
έλαιη,
έπιτρο
έποπτο
έρευθε
έχρην,
ζεια, 5
η, ην (

41, 1
22 : 72.

ome and
69 D.C.,

d Latin,

Chrono-
r's The

i Platon

nt revi-
itics in
Republic

nses, 91

f Greek

s illus-
, 75

d Cho.

85

ssenia,
nd das
's The
denistic
6. On

steenth

nquête

D.C.,

ce.

i 30:

in. ii

: 77

: 33

Indr.

2: 8.

177:

: 7;

Eustathius 633: 116
Ev. Ioann. v 39: 72
Heliodus *Aeth.* ix 15 ff.: 113 ff.
Hermippus fr. 45: 5
Herodotus passim: 57 ff.; v 33: 55
Homer *Il.* i 338: 71; iii 236 ff.: 17; v 523: 65;
xviii 507 ff.: 71. *Od.* iv 500 ff.: 64
Horace *AP* 453 ff.: 20
Hyginus 80: 14
IG ii² 477, 672, 682, 791: 85; 4311 i: 3; xii 5 872,
873, 875, 877: 64
Jerome *Epp.* 38 4, 64 18: 112
Julius Valerius i 35: 115
Lampridius *Severus Alex.* 56: 115
Litur xiii 24 7-9: 69; 32 14, 37 2: 70; xxxv 48 3:
115; xxxvii 40 5, 42 2: 115
Lucian *Fug.* 13. *Zeus Trag.* 51: 116
LXX Ex. 12 7, 22, 23: 110
Lycophron 546 ff.: 13
Martial vi 59 5: 113
Ovid *AA* iii 274: 112. *Ex Ponto* I i 37 ff.: 20.
Fast. v 693 ff.: 14
Palladius *RR* vi 1 2, vii 2 1: 70
Pap. Gr. Mag. 4 744: 109; 1496: 110
Pap. Masp. 67353 A 32: 3
Pap. Ox. 900, 1163, 2039: 3; 2079 i 1: 109
Pausanias iv 3 1: 14
Pherocrates fr. 64: 5
Philo *de leg.* 22, 108, *de som.* ii 119: 116
Philodemus π. σημ. passim: 121
Pindar *N.* vii 44: 3; 60 ff.: 13. *O.* iii 1: 103, 106;
iii 17: 3; x 99: 3. *P.* iv 198: 71
Plato *comicus* fr. 69 5: 6
Plato *Phd.* 101 D: 119. *Rp.* passim: 118; 328 c: 7;

382 A: 122; 436 B: 119; 509 D-510 A: 120. *Symp.*
174 B: 72; 203 D: 71; 215 A: 72
Plautus *Amph.* 985: 67. *Bacch.* 276, 545: 67. *Circ.*
512: 67. *Epid.* 359: 67. *Pseud.* 26 f., 544a, 1203 f.:
66; 1322: 67. *Rud.* 538, 646: 67
Pliny *NH* xiii 11-13: 61; xix 1: 61; xxviii 117:
111
Plutarch *Alc.* i: 72. *Cor.* 32: 116. *Crass.* 25, 27:
115. *Lucull.* 28: 114, 115. *Mor.* 169 B: 63
Pollux ix 27: 116
Polybius xvi 18 6, xxx 25-9: 113
Sallust *H. fr.* iv 66: 114
Schol. *Il. N* 66: 64
Scol. Anon. 8 (Diehl ii 185): 71
Servius ad Verg. *Aen.* xi 768 ff.: 114
Simonides *Epigr.* 148: 24
Sophocles passim: 4, 7. *Ant.* 586 ff.: 100. *OT* 1389:
7. *Tr.* 564: 8. *Fv.* 107: 4
Statius *Ach.* ii 142: 117. *Silv.* ii 1 130: 112. *Theb.*
xiii 198 f.: 117
Tacitus *Ann.* xiv 36 i: 117. *Hist.* i 65: 117; i 79:
114, 115
Tertullian *de cult. fem.* i 2: 112
Theocritus passim: 109 ff.; i 21, 22, 56: 9; ii 59-62:
9, 109; xxii: 11; xxii 77: 12; xxx 20, 21: 10
Theophrastus *Ch.* 16 15: 109. *De sign.* 45: 65
Thucydides vi 2 4: 122
Tibullus i 2 54: 109
Varro *RR* i 32 1: 70
Vegetius *de re mil.* iii 23: 116
Virgil *Aen.* vii 803 ff.: 19; xi 483, 532 ff.: 19. *G. i*
24 ff., 36 ff.: 18; 466, 489 ff., 509, 511: 19
Vopiscus *Aurel.* II: 115
Xenophon *Cyr.* vi 4 1, vii 1 2: 113

III. INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

ἄγμα, 93
ἀγνογή ('love-charm'), 110
ἄκανθα, 62
ἄκρα *Γυρέων*, 63
ἄλεντρον, 58
ἄλφιτον, 58
ἄμπελος, 59
ἄνθερικες, 61
ἄνηρον, 60
ἄρβηλος, 75, 116
ἄσταφίς, 59
ἄπομον, 92
Ἄφαρεύς, Ἀφάρης, 13
βάλανος, 59, 63
βύβλος, 61
βύστος, 61
γερουσία, 86
Γυρέων, *Γυράια*, 64
δεῖ, χρῆ, 5, 6
δρῦς, 61
ἔβενος, 62
ἔδει, ἔχρην, 5, 6
εἰκασία () πάτος, 120
ἔλαίη, 59
ἐπιτρύζειν, 109
ἐπόπται, 23
ἔρευθέδανον, 61
ἔχρην, χρῆν, 2, 6
ζειά, 58
ἢ, ἦν ('I was'), 6

ἡμῖν, ὑμῖν, 8
θάτηα, 9
θαλαμῆ, 55
θάλαμος ('forward cabin'), 55
Θεοί *Σωτῆρες*, 17
θρόνος (= φάρμακα), 110
ἱερά (γραμμῆ), 116
ἱράς, 13
ἱππότα, 26
ἱτέη, 62
κακάρτανος, 71
κάλαμος, 61
κάλυξ, 63
κάναβις, 61
κασίν, 60
κατάδεσμος, 110
κατάφρακτος ἵππος, 113
κέγχρος, 58
κέδρος, 60
κηρύον, 75
κινεῖν τὸν ἀρέτην ἱερᾶς, 116
κιννάμωμον, 60
κοντός, 113, 115
κράνεια, 62
κρηνίας, κρηνίς, 9
κριθή, 58
κρίνον, 62

κρόμμυον, 59
κύαμος, 59
κυπάρισσος, 60
κύπερος, 61
λάδανον, 60
λειρισίεις, 98
λευκόλινον, 61
λίβανος, 60
λῖνος, 61
λοιπόν, 65
λυτός ('jujube'), 59;
(Nile water-lily), 62
μάσσειν, 109, 111 (cf.
10)
μελίνη, 58
μήκων, 75
μῆλον, 59
μυρίκη, 60
μυροίη, 62
ξύλον ('cotton-plant'), 61
οἰλυνθός, 59
οἴλυρα, 58
οὐτρας, οὐτω, 9
πάσσειν, 10
πάτος () εἰκασία, 120
πάτνη, 62
πλατάνιος, 62
ποίη, 58
ποντικὸν δένδρεον, 59
πυρός, 58

ρόδδα, 62
ροιή, 59
σελινον, 59
σήσαμον, 60
σιλικόπτρον, 60
σιλφιον, 60
σῖτος, 58
σκόροδον, 59
σιμόρη, 60
σπείρα, σφαῖρα, 13
στιτάξ, 60
συνέη, 59
συρμαη, 59
σχῖνος, 60
σχῖνος, 61
τριαντάφυλλον, 62
τρίφιλλον, 62
τρύπημα, 55
ὑποκριτής, 25
φακός, 59
φηγός, 62
φιλτροκατάδεσμος, 110
φιλύρη, 62
φιλά, 110
φοῦνε, 59
φιλακτήριον, 109
φιλλον, 63
χρῆν, ἔχρην, 2, 6
χρόνοι ('beats'), 103
χωριστόν, 92

PRINTED IN
GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE
UNIVERSITY PRESS
OXFORD
BY
JOHN JOHNSON
PRINTER
TO THE
UNIVERSITY



The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by

† T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D.

E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D. W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.

L. A. POST, M.A. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A.

Founded by JAMES LOEB

Each volume Folio 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net; leather, 12s. 6d. net

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—*Times Literary Supplement*.

NEW VOLUMES, 1942-1943

LATIN

348, 349 CICERO. DE ORATORE, DE FATO, PARADOXA STOICORUM, PARTITIONES ORATORIAE. Two volumes.
Translated by E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham.

352 PLINY. NATURAL HISTORY. Ten volumes; Vol. II, Books III-VII. Translated by H. Rackham.

GREEK

364 DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS. ROMAN ANTIQUITIES. Seven volumes; Vol. IV, Books VI. 49-end, and VII. Translated by E. Cary.

365 JOSEPHUS. Nine volumes; Vol. VII. ANTIQUITIES, Books XII-XIV. Translated by R. Marcus.

366 ARISTOTLE. GENERATION OF ANIMALS. Translated by A. L. Peck.

Machine or Mind? (an introduction to the Loeb Classical Library). *Free together with Descriptive Prospectus, &c.*

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, LTD., Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

The Awakening of Western Legal Thought

DR. MAX HAMBURGER

10s. 6d. net

'One of the most lucid contributions to the subject. The author's deep insight into one of the most constructive periods of Greek philosophy, and his thorough acquaintance with thinkers and events of the time, are consummated in a brilliant little survey of the moral and social doctrines, . . . a valuable help for students of what Greek antiquity may still teach the modern world.'—*The Empire Review*.

'This is a book which we would commend highly. . . . The message of the classical world to that of the present time is emphasized with clarity. . . .'—*Inquirer*.

'I have read your book and fully agree with your general point of view which I think is excellently stated in the introduction.'—Dr. GILBERT MURRAY in a letter to the author.

'It is a very interesting study.'—*Law Journal*.

GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD

40 MUSEUM STREET, LONDON W.C.1.

UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD, ENGLAND

